CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1951

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room F-39, the Capitol, Hon. Kenneth McKellar (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators McKellar, Ellender, Young, Knowland, Ecton, Holland, and Stennis.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT S. KERR, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, LEVEE CONSTRUCTION

Chairman MCKELLAR. The committee will come to order.

Senator Kerr will be the first witness this morning.

Have you a prepared statement, Senator Kerr?

Senator KERR. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Will you put your statement in the record and highlight it in any way you please and talk as long as you like?

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KERR

Mr. Chairman, the destruction caused by floods at Kansas City and in nearby areas of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma in the past few weeks is fresh in the minds of the members of this committee.

You have heard this disaster described as the work of a flood that comes once in a hundred years, but I want to say to this committee that some place in that area is hit by just such devastation almost every year. It is not uncommon for a large part of our total annual rainfall to hit the earth in a few hours on the heels of months of drought. Sometimes these rains fall upon the northern part of the Arkansas-Missouri Basin in Kansas and drain into the Missouri River. Sometimes they fall on the southern part of Kansas and drain into the Arkansas valley, flooding the fertile lands of northern and eastern Oklahoma as they go.

One of the tributaries of the Arkansas River which carried the great Kansas rains into Oklahoma this year was the Neosho which damaged a dozen Kansas cities before it reached Miami, Okla., where 3,000 people were forced to leave their homes. The damage in Miami and Ottawa County alone is estimated at $6,000,000.

Another Kansas-Oklahoma tributary of the Arkansas is the Verdigris which had already this month destroyed thousands of acres of promising crops in Kansas

and Oklahoma and flooded several cities before the rains came which brought devastation to Kansas City and the areas along the Missouri as well.

A third is the Chikaskia. This year we have had floods on all three, on the Arkansas, in western Oklahoma and at Waurika in southern Oklahoma too.

Out in Oklahoma people ask me why our Government cannot do something to protect them if it has so many billions to spend for the protection of people across the seas. I believe that the members of this committee feel about this just as I do, and the big question in your minds is: How can we go forward with a program of flood-control work at the same time that we are faced with an international situation which threatens to engulf the entire world?

My answer to that question is this:

First, there are flood-control projects on which the Congress has taken three steps—authorization, planning, initial construction—but which have been halted because of the international situation.

Second, there are projects on which the Congress has taken two steps—authorization and planning.

Third, there are projects on which the Congress has taken the first step—authorization.

I believe that Congress must continue to advance these projects.

In the first group, the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas are interested in a vital project on the Verdigris River—Oologah. The Army engineers tell us that had Oologah been built, it would have this year saved crops worth $2,700,000 in its own valley. This is nearly 10 percent of what it will cost to build—and there have been five floods on the Verdigris in Oklahoma in the last 10 years, each of which has been as great or greater than the biggest flood on the river this year.

The floods on the Verdigris are so common that only the highest of the bottom lands are farmed. Oologah would protect 84,000 acres of the richest land in the world from most floods, and when it is built the annual value of the crops in that valley which it will protect will not be $2,700,000, but, at least, $10,000,000. We are advised that construction of Oologah can go forward in an orderly manner for 18 months before any steel is needed. The expansion of the steel industry which is now in progress will be completed by the fall of 1952, and the present pinch relieved.

In the second group of projects, those authorized and planned but not started, we Oklahomans have a keen interest in the Toronto Dam on the main stem of the Verdigris in southern Kansas. Toronto should be started, and as much work done as is possible without entering the competition for steel at this time.

Over in the Kansas River Valley, I am informed, the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam is in the same class with the Toronto Dam on the Verdigris.

I believe General Pick has advised this committee that any flood-control program for Kansas should include them both. Altogether there are at this time three reservoir projects in the recent flooded section completely planned and ready for construction money: Oologah, Toronto, and Tuttle Creek.

In the third group, authorized but not yet planned, are six comparatively small Kansas dams which mean much to us in Oklahoma. Four of these—Strawn, Council Grove, Marion, Cedar Point—are on the Neosho. Two, Neodesha and Elk City, are on the Verdigris.

We in Oklahoma believe that Strawn should come first because, had it been built, we would not now be faced with the terrific job of rehabilitation at Miami, Okla.

Mr. Chairman, there is another and important reason why work should go forward as rapidly as possible on Oologah and Toronto. The people who live on the reservoir sites are entitled to be paid for their land so that they may move to their new homes. They have been put on notice as to the Government's intentions. Neither public agencies nor private citizens can afford to make additional investments which they know will be flooded when the dams are built. Few private buyers want land which they know is soon to be condemned by the Government. These people are caught in a blighted area, and common decency calls for us to treat them justly.

Recently, we who represent the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma directed attention of this committee to the critical situation at Bradens Bend on the Arkansas River at the Oklahoma-Arkansas line. Here is a place of potential tragedy because caving banks are about to divert the larger flow of the Arkansas into the channel of the Poteau, a smaller tributary. When this occurs—and it will soon do so unless prevented—floodwaters will take with them not only thousands of acres of fertile land, but also rail and road bridges and parts of the industrial area of Fort Smith.

We cry for flood control on the upper reaches of these streams, but we would not have you forget the need of immediate action downstream where these floodwaters must be contained.

Bank stabilization at Bradens Bend and other critical points in Arkansas where railroad bridges and gas and oil pipelines are threatened will take no critical materials, nor is it a costly work if taken in time.

Measured by the benefits, all of these proposed projects are profitable public investments—not pork barrel or give-away. In the potent words of the Kansas City Star, "The time to take action is now."

Gentlemen, the elements do not wait for us. The people of our section need flood protection now." We have seen the two greatest floods in the history of eastern Oklahoma hit Fort Smith, Ark., on the Oklahoma border within the span of a few days. Members of the Senate who flew over St. Charles, Mo., when the Missouri was at its peak this week, carrying 600,000 cubic feet a second past that point, saw a great flood. Yet, not once but twice in 1943, in a matter of days, the Arkansas carried more than 800,000 cubic feet a second from Oklahoma into Arkansas and took with it 23 human lives and did hundreds of millions of dollars' damage to private and public property. No matter how many problems we may have, I do not see for the life of me how we can ever with a clear conscience fail to do what is required to achieve adequate flood control. The greater our needs for production, the more important it is we be prepared to meet them.

You can go forward with construction that does not take steel now. We can complete the planning job. For Oologah we can save at least 1 year. For Tuttle Creek and Toronto, we can save two. For Strawn and other authorized dams in Kansas, we can save three.

There is a tendency in talking about flood-control projects to confine ourselves to the cold economic aspects of the problem. But I was struck by a remark made by our new Governor of Oklahoma, Johnston Murray, in talking to members of the Public Works Committee when they were in Oklahoma.

You know Governor Murray has had about the same experience in the first few months of his administration that I had as Governor 8 years ago. Then, as now, soon after the legislature adjourned the State was hit by a tremendous flood. I went into the flooded areas and saw the human misery which goes along with economic desolation. Governor Murray has done likewise, and his remarks about what he saw is very important. He told us he had observed it is "the little people" who suffer most when their homes and their crops are taken by the floods. No one can see such misery and ever forget it, Mr. Chairman. We must see to it that this does not happen again.

ARKANSAS RIVER WATERSHED

Senator KERR. Mr. Chairman, the first thing I would like to say to this committee is that this flood in the Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma area has been described all over the country as one that comes every 100 years. Now, the fact is that there is a flood of some kind every year in that area; somewhere in Oklahoma every year is a destructive flood, and about half of them are from water that comes out of the State of Kansas.

Now, that is not the fault of the State of Kansas; that is just the way the watershed is. I want to tell you that in my opinion southern Kansas is an area as large as the State of Tennessee. I believe that the southern half of Kansas is as large as either Tennessee, Mississippi, or Louisiana. There are about 36,000 square miles in the southern half of Kansas. All of the water that falls in that part of the State is in the Arkansas watershed, so that that portion of it that is not stopped where it falls or between where it falls and the State line of Oklahoma comes into Oklahoma.

All of the water that falls in southwestern Missouri comes into Oklahoma. All of the water that falls in northwest Arkansas comes over into Oklahoma.

We are the drainage area for the southeastern part of Colorado. We are the drainage area for the eastern part of New Mexico. We are the drainage area for all of the Panhandle of Texas.

Now, all that I have told you about except the southern part of the Panhandle of Texas drains into the Arkansas River.

Chairman McKellar. Do you have a map covering the situation around Oklahoma?

Senator Kerr. This is a small-scale map, but here is Oklahoma and here is Kansas [indicating], north and south between those fingers and east and west between these fingers. The entire half of Kansas drains into the Arkansas. The Arkansas heads up here in Colorado. Actually, a third of the State of Colorado drains into the Arkansas River. Actually the northeastern part of New Mexico drains into the Arkansas watershed.

Senator Ellender. You do not get much water through that area; do you, Senator?

Senator Kerr. Occasionally we do. I made the statement that somewhere in Oklahoma every year there is a flood, which with reference to the area that it affects is just as devastating as the flood has been this year.

Senator Ellender. On the map that appears beneath the one you are showing us there is a demarcation of what is known as the Missouri flood area. Do you notice that dark line?

Senator Kerr. Right across here; that is right.

Senator Ellender. We understand that the Oklahoma Basin that you speak of is below that.

Senator Kerr. That is correct; and there is just as much of Kansas in the Arkansas watershed as there is in the Missouri watershed.

Senator Ellender. What is there separating the area that you are now describing from the Missouri?

Senator Kerr. There is a high ridge that goes through the entire State of Kansas east and west just south of the Kaw River. Practically all of the Kaw River watershed is north of the Kaw River.

Senator Stennis. It shows on this map clearly all south Kansas.

Senator Kerr. Here it is [indicating]. You see this ridge that goes right across the center of the State of Kansas from east to west? The fact about the business is that it comes north up here almost to Topeka. Topeka is only a fourth of the way down the State of Kansas; yet this ridge swings in the middle of the State to the northeast so that, when you come just a little bit south of Topeka and west, you get to the headwaters of the Neosho River. There it is right there, far up above the middle of the State of Kansas [indicating]. There are the headwaters of the Neosho that come down here into Oklahoma.

While it does not show here, all this part of Missouri, which is west of these Ozark Mountains and south of the Osage River that flows into the Lake of the Ozarks, drains into Oklahoma. So that northeastern Oklahoma is the area that gets most of the water that falls in the State of Kansas that runs out of the State of Kansas. Of course, that is the drainage area of the Arkansas River.

Senator Ellender. That is where the State of Oklahoma comes into the picture?

Senator Kerr. Yes, sir.

Senator Ellender. Is that the Arkansas Basin that we speak of?

Senator Kerr. That you are now studying; that is correct.

CONSERVATION OF SOIL AND WATER

Senator ELLENDER. I presume your prescription to remedy all of this is the building of these dams?

Senator KERR. My prescription for it is the comprehensive plan for the conservation of soil and water. You see, there can be no soil conservation without water conservation. Of course, water conservation goes a long way toward the conservation of the soil. Aside from municipal and industrial water and recreation and navigation and power, the purpose of water conservation is to conserve soil.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Yes, sir; and it is a comparatively late undertaking on the part of the Government. As far as it has been carried out in Oklahoma, has it been successful? Has it helped your State?

Senator KERR. Let me illustrate that. I am glad the chairman asked that question.

The Neosha and the Verdigris drain the southeastern part of Kansas, come right down northeastern Oklahoma and parallel each other. The Neosho River in Oklahoma becomes the Grand River after the union of the Spring with it. You see, we have been fighting for years and years for flood-control projects on the upper Neosho and Verdigris in the State of Kansas. We have succeeded in building two reservoirs on the Grand in Oklahoma. In 1936 and 1937 Pensacola was built here on the upper Grand in Oklahoma by the PWA and the State of Oklahoma. Actually the Federal Government furnished all the money. Part of it is grant and part of it is loan. This committee provided the funds for the Fort Gibson Reservoir on the Grand right here above where the Grand runs into the Arkansas.

FLOOD PROTECTION BY PENSACOLA AND FORT GIBSON DAMS

Now, this time above Pensacola in northeastern Oklahoma we had the largest flood in the history of our State on the Neosho and Grand Rivers. It was 10 feet higher in Miami, Okla., than it had ever been before.

Senator ELLENDER. When was that?

Senator KERR. Two weeks ago.

Senator ELLENDER. Even though the dams were built?

Senator KERR. But the dams are below that. You see, the ones above that, although authorized, have not been built.

Senator ELLENDER. How about the land below the dam?

Senator KERR. That is what I am getting to, Senator. The Pensacola and Fort Gibson Dams held that biggest flood in the history of weather recording. So that there was practically no damage below Pensacola and the Fort Gibson Dam although in fact it actually is not entirely completed.

General CHORPENING. That is right. It was completed far enough so that we could store some water during this flood.

Senator KERR. But the project is not complete in all of its ways. That historic flood made no impact on the Arkansas below Fort Gibson. Yet practically all of the water fell in southeast Kansas and southwest Missouri. So that in the area where the dams were not in to protect it, we had the worst damage in history. In the area below where the dams had been built there was no damage.

Chairman McKellar. You regard that as rather an argument in favor of the dams?

Senator Kerr. I would regard it as positive a demonstration of the wisdom of the program as nature and man working together ever will provide.

TORONTO DAM, KANS.

Now then 2 years ago on the upper Verdigris this committee put in $1,000,000 for Toronto. The Verdigris has had this year two floods. This committee put $1,000,000 in for Toronto 2 years ago, and it put construction money in for Oologah last year. If those two dams had been in, it would have saved from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 worth of damage this year. On the Verdigris River in the last 10 years there have been five floods that have done an average of over $2,000,000 worth of damage a year.

Chairman McKellar. What sort of lands are they?

Senator Kerr. On the Verdigris River between Oologah and Arkansas is 84,000 acres of good land as there is in the Mississippi delta. The farmers do not even put half of it in. They only put in that which is in the higher areas. In the last 10 years that has been flooded out five times.

Now the Army engineers and the Senators were talking about flying over the Mississippi at Cape Girardeau where this Missouri River ran into it. Was it the Missouri that was discharging 600,000 second-feet into the Mississippi?

General Chorpening. Yes, sir.

1943 FLOOD

Senator Kerr. In 1943 we had two floods on the Arkansas where at Fort Smith, Ark., which is one of Senator McClellan's towns, the Arkansas was carrying 800,000 second-feet—twice in 1 year. There was a more terrific flood there than there was with all this water that the Missouri dumped into the Mississippi. Much of that water came from southwest Missouri and southeast Kansas and northeast Oklahoma. In this area we had 15 inches of rain in 48 hours.

I remember it especially in 1943 because I was Governor then. We went into every county that was damaged and tried to make some realistic appraisal of the damage and give as much information as we could to the people. The last one of those floods hit in May, as I remember. After the water went down the farmers went back in there and put in a crop. That is all they can do.

Chairman McKellar. They would have to have a short growth crop, would they not?

Senator Kerr. If they can put either cotton or corn in that valley in June, it will make. They went back in there after that last terrible flood went down, and they put in their crops again, and they were doing fine. In the middle of July it looked like they were going to make a wonderful crop, but the hot winds hit them and in August the second or third crop they had planted that year burned up.

The dramatic thing is that if the flood control were in, it would keep the water off them in flood time and it would be available for them in dry time.

As Governor Murray said to this committee the other day, I can visualize the damage that these things do to industries. I drove through Kansas City's industrial area. I want to say that the destruction there was worse than total loss because if a hurricane had hit there and just swept the ground clean of everything that was on it, they would have had good firm ground and their utilities in to go back and rebuild it. The way it is, it is going to cost them heavily to move the debris and the mud out and repair the utilities before they can start building back. So actually their destruction was worse than total insofar as their buildings and things were concerned.

SOIL DAMAGE BY FLOOD

But that was not the greatest damage that was done, gentlemen. When they get through tabulating the damage on this flood, just like all the rest of them, I do not care whether the total is $1,000,000, $100,000,000, or $1,000,000,000, the greatest damage is not to what is on top of the soil, but the greatest damage is to the soil.

We had a fight on the floor yesterday for soil conservation and finally succeeded in putting in an inadequate amount. In reality we are losing more soil each year from floods than from any other cause. I just cannot conceive of how men charged with responsibility for the future of their country can look these facts in the face and fail to be alert to the job of a more aggressive soil and water conservation program than we have under way.

Here are the facts: Our population is increasing at the rate of 3,000,000 a year. I believe the record will show right now that we import as much food as we export. I would say that as of today, while we are an exporting country, we import as much agricultural products as we export.

Chairman McKellar. Do we have any figures on that, General?

General Chorpening. No, sir; I do not.

Chairman McKellar. Is there any way those figures can be obtained?

General Chorpening. Some Government departments will have those and we will obtain them and put them in the record.

Chairman McKellar. Do that and let the committee have those figures.

(The information referred to was filed with the committee.)

SOIL LOSSES

Senator Kerr. We are losing 500,000 acres of soil a year in this country.

Chairman McKellar. Of course, soil is being made somewhere.

Senator Kerr. It is not being made where it is productive. We are losing 500,000 acres a year. Our population is increasing at the rate of 3,000,000 a year.

You know, they talk about how much wheat, cotton, and corn and how much else we produce; we are producing more babies than anything else. The baby crop is the biggest bumper crop we are having in this country. They talk about how many people we are going to have in this country 15 years from now. They say in 1980 we will have reached the peak and all that stuff. They have been talking about when we are going to reach the peak for 30 years. They do not know

when we are going to reach the peak. I am saying to you that we will have 200,000,000 people in this country in 15 to 18 years.

Chairman McKellar. Will there be any outside of Washington?

Senator Kerr. That is an interesting viewpoint, but that dramatizes what I have to say. I do not care how many there will be in Washington; they are not going to produce any food, and somebody has to produce food for 200,000,000 people or we will be in the embarrassing position of being a have not Nation.

We are producing this bumper crop of babies in spite of the fact that those coming of age are at the lowest point since the turn of the century. Those coming of age now are of the depression years. Actually there are fewer of them; 20 years from now, Mr. Chairman, there will be twice as many marriages in this country per year as there are now; 20 years from now there will be twice as many marriages among those 20 to 25 years of age as there are now.

Senator Ellender. To further dramatize the statement you made a while ago, I placed in the record the day before yesterday a statement to show that there are in our country today 460,000,000 acres of tillable soil all of which is in use in some way or another. Now, if the population should increase at the rate of 6,000 per day, as is now the case, over a period of 15 years your population will have increased about 33,000,000 people, and the loss in good, tillable land because of soil erosion will be 7,500,000 acres. So your population is increasing and your land is decreasing. It is just a question of time when we will not be able to produce sufficient food to maintain the population.

Senator Kerr. That is right. With those facts before us, we and we alone, the Congress of this country, are going to either see to it that the land is here with which to feed those people or the land is not going to be here.

Senator Ellender. The trouble is, Senator, that too many people in Congress and outside of Congress give merely lip service to this problem, that is all. They see it, but somehow they do not vote right.

Senator Kerr. I certainly appreciate that contribution to this discussion because it dramatizes that which to me, Mr. Chairman, is the most important material fact that I know. That dramatizes this fact, and I want to close with it.

There are those who say we cannot afford to do this. Well, they are wrong on two counts. The wisest, smartest men we have stuck their necks out months ago and said when July 1 came we would have a $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 deficit. We had a $3½ billion surplus. That is how far wrong those people are who attempt to put a ceiling on American production and American productive capacity.

I am saying to you that we cannot afford not to do these things. The worst indictment that the men in the Congress of the United States in these years will have can come 15 and 20 years from now and will be from their own realization of what they failed to do in the matter of soil and water conservation and on the part then of the high school kids who will be saying how short-sighted and how unrealistic they were and how bitterly they failed to meet the greatest challenge of this period.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McKellar. We are very much obliged to you, Senator. Mr. R. B. Clarke is the next witness to be heard.

Levee Construction, St. Charles, Mo.

STATEMENT OF R. B. CLARKE, ST. CHARLES, MO.

JUNCTION OF MISSOURI-MISSISSIPPI RIVERS

Mr. Clarke. My name is R. B. Clarke, St. Charles, Mo.

Chairman McKellar. Do you have a prepared statement?

Mr. Clarke. No, I have not. I will be very brief. I have a map here showing our condition.

We have a peculiar situation in St. Charles County. You gentlemen are probably familiar with St. Charles County. As I understand, the Missouri Basin program is a series of reservoirs to prevent these floods which it will take several years to build.

CHANGE IN CHANNEL

This represents the north end of St. Charles County. Here is St. Charles. Here is Machens. This is the Missouri River; this is the Mississippi River. At this point here this represents a change of channel which in 1944 broke through and flowed into the Mississippi River. I understand from good authority that there is a 13-foot drop between the Missouri and the Mississippi River.

Chairman McKellar. Has it broken through since that time?

Mr. Clarke. It broke through in 1944 and every time we have a flood now—it is all under water now. The only protection was the M. K. & T. tracks and every flood that breaks and at this point is what we call the Grouse Cut. That is a channel cut through a ridge there. It is destroying all this land down here due to the change in channel.

The farms here are being covered with sand up to 2½ feet. Here where it empties with that fall it is destroying this farm land by erosion. It is all washing out starting here and backing up.

Senator Ellender. You say that cut falls 13 feet from where?

Mr. Clarke. From the Missouri to the Mississippi.

Senator Ellender. Do you know what the distance is?

Mr. Clarke. Mr. Wilke, what is the distance?

Mr. Wilke. It is about 12 miles.

LENGTH OF PROPOSED LEVEE

Mr. Clarke. Now at this point, Machens, is a high ridge there. St. Charles is a high ridge. A 12-mile levee would protect about 25,000 acres of ground and save the ground from being destroyed.

Senator Ellender. Is the plan to close than channel?

Mr. Clarke. The red line is a proposed levee, as I understand, that has been planned by the Government. Building a 12-mile levee would stop than channel and save all this land in there.

Chairman McKellar. How many acres are in that area there?

Mr. Clarke. About 20,000 acres. Mr. Wilke has the figures, which he will supply for the record.

Senator ELLENDER. Has that project been authorized?
Mr. CLARKE. Yes, sir.
Senator ELLENDER. Has any money been spent on it?
Mr. CLARKE. No, sir.
Senator ELLENDER. Is there any budget estimate?
General CHORPENING. No, sir.

LAND LOSSES

Mr. CLARKE. You speak of agricultural levees. This is more than an agricultural levee. Our crop loss is secondary to the loss of our soil. We have a gentleman here, Mr. Simon, who has two farms that are practically washed away now.

At this point here was a big, fine farm. The soil was worth $300 to $400 an acre. It all washed away.

At this point here there was a school that had been located there for 75 years. It had elm trees in the yard 2½ and 3 feet in diameter. That came through there; there was nothing left, school, trees, and all.

So we feel that if there is not some relief this entire area will be destroyed.

Senator ELLENDER. What effect did the last flood of a few weeks ago have on that area?

Mr. CLARKE. This entire area was covered, and it is covered yet.

Senator ELLENDER. Has it widened the area?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes. In this channel here acres of soil are falling in now. You see, we have a peculiar soil condition. We have a topsoil and underlying it is sand, and this sand will continue to fall in there even after the river goes down. It has undermined that sand underneath and it caves in.

CROPS

Chairman MCKELLAR. With what sort of crops is this land planted at this time of the year?

Mr. CLARKE. Corn and soybeans.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Do you have time now to plant again?

Mr. CLARKE. No. The way this flood is receding there is a lot of land in this area that I doubt they can even prepare for wheat this fall. All we can do is hope to get in a wheat crop or let the land lie idle until next spring.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Of course, there is some fertilizing, but as a general thing, do those lands have to be fertilized each year?

Mr. CLARKE. No, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You do not?

Mr. CLARKE. No, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The general rule is not to use fertilizer?

Mr. CLARKE. Some use fertilizer, but as a general rule, no. Most of this ground is natural alfalfa ground; it will grow alfalfa; it will grow anything.

Now I think I have given you a general picture and it can all be cured with a 10- to 12-mile levee, which is a part of your program.

Senator ELLENDER. Was that levee at the place where the river broke?

Mr. CLARKE. No.

Senator ELLENDER. Just a new channel formed?

Mr. CLARKE. Here is what happened. This line represents the M. K. & T. Railroad. That held the water back to a certain height. Then it goes over and washes the M. K. & T. out, and the M. K. & T. Railroad is the only levee we have there.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Was the M. K. & T. affected at all by the flood?

Mr. CLARKE. The M. K. & T., Burlington. There is no railroad operating in the north end of town at all. The elevators are full of moist grain; they cannot ship it out. Portage Des Sioux is on an island. In order for the mail carrier to cover the territory around here, he comes here [indicating], parks his car, crosses the channel in a boat, picks up another car on the other side, picks up the mail and goes back—two cars and a boat in order to get mail services to these people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have Mr. Wilke speak for a few minutes, if he may.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We are very much obliged to you.

STATEMENT OF OTTO WILKE, ST. CHARLES, MO.

LEVEE CONSTRUCTION, ST. CHARLES, MO.

Mr. WILKE. My name is Otto Wilke. My address is St. Charles, Mo.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What is your business?

Mr. WILKE. I am a merchant and a farmer.

I merely would like to follow up and add to certain things that Mr. Clarke has pointed out. This trip of ours to Washington got a lot of publicity and St. Charles County knows we are here. Our county extension agent wrote me a letter which I would like to read and put in the record.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, sir.

Mr. WILKE (reading):

JULY 26, 1951.

OTTO WILKE,
St. Charles, Mo.

DEAR MR. WILKE: It is difficult to make an estimate on the damage done by the recent flood to crops and farm property in St. Charles County. I have had various estimates of the agricultural loss ranging from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000. I have, however, talked to a number of farmers in the area and from what information I have received the following are the estimates I would make:

(1) Fifty-five to sixty thousand acres of cropland flooded sufficiently to totally destroy all crops in the affected area. The total area flooded is approximately 90,000 acres.

(2) A crop loss of $3,000,000. Crops in the area estimated to be 40 percent corn, 40 percent wheat, 15 percent soybeans, and the remaining 5 pasture and hay.

(3) At least $1,250,000 damage to farm buildings, fences and farm land. The survey made by the Red Cross indicates 426 farm homes in the area with about 90 percent of them damaged in varying degrees. They estimate an average damage of $2,000 to each farm home and its surrounding buildings. The damage to the soil it is difficult to estimate until the water goes down. There will undoubtedly be a lot of homes gouged out and sandpiled and scattered over some of the good land.

(4) The flood has also created health hazards which are difficult to put in terms of money.

(5) This flood and the repetition of floods in the past 10 years is damaging to the morale of the people in the area.

Senator ELLENDER. Has that project been authorized?
Mr. CLARKE. Yes, sir.
Senator ELLENDER. Has any money been spent on it?
Mr. CLARKE. No, sir.
Senator ELLENDER. Is there any budget estimate?
General CHORPENING. No, sir.

LAND LOSSES

Mr. CLARKE. You speak of agricultural levees. This is more than an agricultural levee. Our crop loss is secondary to the loss of our soil. We have a gentleman here, Mr. Simon, who has two farms that are practically washed away now.

At this point here was a big, fine farm. The soil was worth $300 to $400 an acre. It all washed away.

At this point here there was a school that had been located there for 75 years. It had elm trees in the yard 2½ and 3 feet in diameter. That came through there; there was nothing left, school, trees, and all.

So we feel that if there is not some relief this entire area will be destroyed.

Senator ELLENDER. What effect did the last flood of a few weeks ago have on that area?

Mr. CLARKE. This entire area was covered, and it is covered yet.

Senator ELLENDER. Has it widened the area?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes. In this channel here acres of soil are falling in now. You see, we have a peculiar soil condition. We have a topsoil and underlying it is sand, and this sand will continue to fall in there even after the river goes down. It has undermined that sand underneath and it caves in.

CROPS

Chairman MCKELLAR. With what sort of crops is this land planted at this time of the year?

Mr. CLARKE. Corn and soybeans.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Do you have time now to plant again?

Mr. CLARKE. No. The way this flood is receding there is a lot of land in this area that I doubt they can even prepare for wheat this fall. All we can do is hope to get in a wheat crop or let the land lie idle until next spring.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Of course, there is some fertilizing, but as a general thing, do those lands have to be fertilized each year?

Mr. CLARKE. No, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You do not?

Mr. CLARKE. No, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The general rule is not to use fertilizer?

Mr. CLARKE. Some use fertilizer, but as a general rule, no. Most of this ground is natural alfalfa ground; it will grow alfalfa; it will grow anything.

Now I think I have given you a general picture and it can all be cured with a 10- to 12-mile levee, which is a part of your program.

Senator ELLENDER. Was that levee at the place where the river broke?

Mr. CLARKE. No.

Senator ELLENDER. Just a new channel formed?

Mr. CLARKE. Here is what happened. This line represents the M. K. & T. Railroad. That held the water back to a certain height. Then it goes over and washes the M. K. & T. out, and the M. K. & T. Railroad is the only levee we have there.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Was the M. K. & T. affected at all by the flood?

Mr. CLARKE. The M. K. & T., Burlington. There is no railroad operating in the north end of town at all. The elevators are full of moist grain; they cannot ship it out. Portage Des Sioux is on an island. In order for the mail carrier to cover the territory around here, he comes here [indicating], parks his car, crosses the channel in a boat, picks up another car on the other side, picks up the mail and goes back—two cars and a boat in order to get mail services to these people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have Mr. Wilke speak for a few minutes, if he may.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We are very much obliged to you.

STATEMENT OF OTTO WILKE, ST. CHARLES, MO.

LEVEE CONSTRUCTION, ST. CHARLES, MO.

Mr. WILKE. My name is Otto Wilke. My address is St. Charles, Mo.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What is your business?

Mr. WILKE. I am a merchant and a farmer.

I merely would like to follow up and add to certain things that Mr. Clarke has pointed out. This trip of ours to Washington got a lot of publicity and St. Charles County knows we are here. Our county extension agent wrote me a letter which I would like to read and put in the record.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, sir.

Mr. WILKE (reading):

JULY 26, 1951.

OTTO WILKE,
St. Charles, Mo.

DEAR MR. WILKE: It is difficult to make an estimate on the damage done by the recent flood to crops and farm property in St. Charles County. I have had various estimates of the agricultural loss ranging from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000. I have, however, talked to a number of farmers in the area and from what information I have received the following are the estimates I would make:

(1) Fifty-five to sixty thousand acres of cropland flooded sufficiently to totally destroy all crops in the affected area. The total area flooded is approximately 90,000 acres.

(2) A crop loss of $3,000,000. Crops in the area estimated to be 40 percent corn, 40 percent wheat, 15 percent soybeans, and the remaining 5 pasture and hay.

(3) At least $1,250,000 damage to farm buildings, fences and farm land. The survey made by the Red Cross indicates 426 farm homes in the area with about 90 percent of them damaged in varying degrees. They estimate an average damage of $2,000 to each farm home and its surrounding buildings. The damage to the soil it is difficult to estimate until the water goes down. There will undoubtedly be a lot of homes gouged out and sandpiled and scattered over some of the good land.

(4) The flood has also created health hazards which are difficult to put in terms of money.

(5) This flood and the repetition of floods in the past 10 years is damaging to the morale of the people in the area.

(6) I have heard of no damage to livestock and machinery although it is possible there has been some.

The above estimates include damage done in both the Missouri and the Mississippi River bottoms. By the time the water goes down and the land dries out enough to work, it will be too late to plant any crops for harvest this fall. All that can be done is to prepare the land for seeding to wheat this fall or letting it lie idle until next spring when it can be put in corn or soybeans.

Very truly yours,

J. B. CARMICHAEL, *County Extension Agent.*

Senator ELLENDER. You live in St. Charles?

Mr. WILKE. Yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. How long have you lived there?

Mr. WILKE. All my life.

NUMBER OF MAJOR FLOODS IN LAST 9 YEARS

Senator ELLENDER. How many floods have occurred in the last 10 years?

Mr. WILKE. In the last 9 years we have had five major floods.

Senator ELLENDER. You say you have a farm in that area?

Mr. WILKE. I do.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Senator ELLENDER. What damage did you suffer on your farm? Is it covered?

Mr. WILKE. I have several farms. A good portion of it is covered at the present time.

Senator ELLENDER. A good portion of the many you have?

Mr. WILKE. Yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. Is it back land or front land, or how does it work? Have you any farms totally covered?

Mr. WILKE. Yes, sir, I do.

Senator ELLENDER. How about your store in St. Charles, was it affected any?

Mr. WILKE. No, it is on high land. However, I do have an elevator that is in the water at the present time, a grain elevator.

Senator ELLENDER. Was there any damage to it?

Mr. WILKE. The elevator is full of moist grain at the present time. The pits are full of water. The basin is full of water. In order to elevate or move this grain, we have to keep the pumps running continuously.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What are you able to do with that moist grain? Can it be processed and sold in time to save any of it?

Mr. WILKE. There will be quite a loss. We have tried to salvage it the best we can. It is heating, it is souring, and as train service is reestablished we will just have to ship to market and take whatever we can get for it.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Your train service is out?

Mr. WILKE. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Do you know how long it will be before it will be restored?

Mr. WILKE. To look at the railroad tracks, I would say it would probably be 4 to 6 weeks before they can put trains back into service.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I should think if the grain is damp now, partially wet now, in 4 to 6 weeks it would be in condition that you cannot use it at all.

Mr. WILKE. This is wheat that the farmers rushed in when the flood waters were coming up on them. It was in no condition to harvest, but rather than take a total loss they got it in with combines and harvested it the best they could and rushed it to the elevator.

Senator ECTON. Who has to take the loss on that, Mr. Wilke, you or the farmers?

Mr. WILKE. I do.

Senator ECTON. Were you not afraid of the floods, too?

Mr. WILKE. Yes, sir, I was.

Senator ECTON. I commend you and congratulate you under those circumstances, that you would go ahead and take the chance. You are an elevator man. I wish we had some of your kind out in my country.

Mr. WILKE. You realize the farmers' predicament, the water was rushing in on them. Naturally they rushed the grain to the elevator and I wanted to help them if I could.

Senator STENNIS. How long has that elevator been at this place?

Mr. WILKE. Twenty-five years.

Senator STENNIS. Why would they put it in this location if it suffers from this flood?

Mr. WILKE. We have only had this serious condition in the last 10 years.

Senator STENNIS. What change has been brought about to cause that now, that you did not have in the past?

Mr. WILKE. I would not say. I know I have some definite ideas.

Senator STENNIS. Give us your ideas on it.

INCREASED FLOWAGE OF MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. WILKE. Well, there is something that has happened. We are getting a lot more water down the river.

Senator STENNIS. Is there any explanation you can give? I think the committee is entitled to know.

Mr. WILKE. As I stated before, I have been a resident of St. Charles County all my life. It appears to me that the river beds are filling up, that we do not have the channels that we used to have. Then when a flood comes, there is not any room there to take care of the water.

SILT IN MISSOURI-MISSISSIPPI RIVER CHANNELS

Chairman MCKELLAR. What causes it to fill up? Is it silt from above?

Mr. WILKE. Both the Missouri and Mississippi River channels are filling up.

Senator STENNIS. They tell us on the lower Mississippi now it is not filling up. Do you have any scientific evidence to counteract that testimony?

Mr. WILKE. I would not be familiar with anything below the Alton Dam, but I do know above the Alton Dam the Mississippi River channel is filling up.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any other questions, gentlemen?

Mr. WILKE. I would like to add a few things to what Mr. Clarke brought out.

RAILROADS AND OIL PIPELINES IN FLOOD AREA

We have both our railroads at the present time out of service, the M. K. & T. Railroad, and the C. B. & Q. Railroad. Along with that we have four pipelines that run through this area. One of those is out at the present time due to the flood; the St. Clair line is out.

Chairman McKellar. Does that pipe oil from Texas?

Mr. Wilke. From the oil fields. I would not want to say where from. They come through this area and lead into Wood River, Ill.

I would like to add my opinion of the seriousness of this threat here that we have from the Missouri River cutting over to the Mississippi River. I think you will have testimony following mine to bear out what I want to bring out at this time. This cut here we call the Upper Lake. This joins in with the Missouri River over here. We call it the Marais Croche. This cut was put in here, was cut through there in 1944. We call this the Marais Temp Clair Lake in here. When the Missouri River gets out of its banks here, cuts across here, and gets into Marais Croche Lake through Grouse Cut into Marais Temp Clair Lake, then it hits into the Mississippi River. This is where it is going out now.

Senator Ecton. You mean it is running back north?

Mr. Wilke. Yes.

Senator Ecton. Running back north?

Mr. Wilke. That is the natural contour of the land. When the Missouri River gets out of its banks the water is going downhill just directly opposite the Mississippi River. The Mississippi River as a rule does not bother us very much. If it gets out of its banks the water pushes back gradually. You let the Missouri River get out of its banks, that is the way it goes; it makes a beeline for the Mississippi River. At the present time the water is cutting out some very valuable farmland right in here.

Senator Ellender. Does that channel ever dry up during the dry period?

Mr. Wilke. This portion here not altogether, but in this cut here the cut is so deep that we have a natural spring that is feeding water continuously into this lake here. What we are afraid of is that if something is not done, this levee is not built, the Missouri River will make a new channel across to the Mississippi River.

Senator Holland. That is the short cut, is it not?

Mr. Wilke. Yes, sir.

Senator Ecton. Now, Mr. Wilke, if these dams as proposed in the Missouri Basin above were developed, would you still be subjected to this spilling over of the Missouri River, if we had the dams above that would hold back some of that extra water? As I understand it, your main trouble comes when the Missouri overflows.

Mr. Wilke. My experience is that there are a lot of times that the Missouri River will get out of its banks, that you have to have some levee here to protect it, because if you do not you may have a couple of floods to cover this area several times during the year. What the dams will do for us, I could not answer that question. If they would be so perfect that the Missouri River would never get out of its banks, I would say that would solve the problem.

Senator ECTON. I think eventually when we get these proper dams and reservoirs constructed in the upper Missouri Basin, it will be possible to regulate the flow of the Missouri River pretty well.

Mr. WILKE. What will we do in the meantime?

Senator ECTON. Of course, that is the question, what we have to do now to protect you.

Senator HOLLAND. Has there been any suggestion for the building of a short levee that would protect against the breaking out of the Missouri there, just northeast of the town, rather than to have a long levee all the way around that peninsular between the two rivers?

PROPOSED ST. CHARLES TO MARCHENS LEVEE, MO.

Mr. WILKE. We feel that a levee from St. Charles to Marchens will solve the biggest proportion of our flood problem.

Senator ECTON. What is that distance?

Mr. WILKE. Approximately 12 miles.

Senator HOLLAND. Do you feel that a 2-mile levee to cut off the chance of the Missouri breaking out and running north of there would solve the problem?

Mr. WILKE. Not a 2-mile levee; I said a 12-mile levee.

Senator HOLLAND. My question was whether there had been any thought given to a short levee that would prevent the breakout from the Missouri.

Mr. WILKE. I do not feel that a 2-mile levee would do us much good.

Senator HOLLAND. Is there high land northwest of the place where the Missouri has broken out across the M. K. & T. tracks?

Mr. WILKE. There is a high point right where the Wabash crosses the Missouri. Our plan would be to tie in with the Wabash right-of-way, follow the river, tie in with the high point at Marchens.

Senator HOLLAND. Is there any high point now northwest of the place where the breakout there crosses the M. K. & T. tracks?

Mr. WILKE. The contour there varies. That is figured to hold a 40-foot stage of water at St. Charles. The height of that levee would vary from 4 to 15 feet at the highest point. The contour varies. There would be a lot of portions in that levee that would not be more than perhaps 4 or 5 feet high.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any further questions, gentlemen? If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Wilke.

Mr. WILKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PICK-SLOAN PLAN

Chairman MCKELLAR. Before I call Mr. Simon, the next witness, I want to ask General Chorpening a question. Has there ever been one project attempted for the Missouri River and its tributaries?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir. The general comprehensive project, of course, as is so well known, is the Pick-Sloan plan, which was authorized by the Congress. Since that time the Congress has directed reviews and reports on certain tributary rivers and the authorized project has been modified and other recommendations have been made for modifications. Some of them are before the committees of Congress today; for instance, the Marais des Cygnes and Osage and

Kansas Rivers, as I recall, are awaiting consideration by the Congress.

Senator HOLLAND. General, has there been any thought or is it possible at all to have a shorter levee that would prevent that outbreak and solve that problem at least until the upstream impounding could be accomplished?

General CHORPENING. I cannot answer that question directly, first, because as far as I know we have never made a study on that; and, second, after this flood there are going to be new conditions there that were not present before. Obviously with the great amount of water that has happened this year and is still flowing through here, there are going to be different conditions existing. I could not possibly make a statement on it until we find out what those conditions are when the water goes down.

Senator HOLLAND. The reason for my question is that as I recall there are some high dry spots in that area between the outbreak there and the Mississippi, some high farms, some high lands that show up from the air. It would seem to me there might be at least a possibility of a much cheaper, much quicker solution that would at least take care of the situation until you get the upstream works accomplished and the river controlled.

General CHORPENING. I just cannot make a factual answer to your question now for those reasons, Senator. Of course, after the water goes down we will make ourselves aware of the situation at and in the vicinity of St. Charles.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I wish you would make the Senate Committee on Appropriations aware of it, too.

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. You see, if the witness has been correctly informed, this 13-foot difference in level between the place of the outbreak on the Missouri just below St. Charles and the place of inflow on this cut-off stream up there, west of Alton on the Mississippi, and yet the levee system outlined there has a levee that completely surrounds that whole tongue of land including the lower point 13 feet below the level where the break-through is accomplished on the Missouri, it would seem to me that there might at least be a possibility of a much shorter levee preventing a break-through effectively even though it would not accomplish protection of some of their lands, low lands, down in the tongue of the delta between the two rivers. As I recall it, that delta was pretty well overflowed, but there were high farm lands standing out well above the water in that area traversed by the M. K. & T. there northward and northeastward of the break-through. Is that your recollection of it?

General CHORPENING. That is right.

Senator HOLLAND. We went over it together. That is my recollection.

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF JOE SIMON, PORTAGE DES SIOUX, MO.

LAND EROSION, MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, Mr. Joe Simon.

Mr. SIMON. My name is Joe Simon. My address is Portage Des Sioux.

Talking about the damage the river has done to the ground, my farms are right in that area. I had channels cut across there now that I know were 5 feet deep. You can see straight banks across the farm. How deep they are we do not know. The water is still going through.

Senator ELLENDER. Are those new cuts?

Mr. SIMON. New cuts. That is close to the Mississippi where it is running through this high ground.

Senator ELLENDER. Where has that land gone, in the Mississippi River?

Mr. SIMON. It must have gone in the Mississippi River. It is within a mile of the river.

Senator ELLENDER. How wide are these channels?

Mr. SIMON. They may not be so wide, but they are getting numerous across the farm. There will be a little ridge out and it will cut the channel.

Senator STENNIS. Does it leave a deposit of sand?

Mr. SIMON. There is no sand being left down in that area. It is too far from the Missouri break-through to leave any sand.

Senator ELLENDER. To what extent does it leave any deposit on your soil?

Mr. SIMON. We have none down there at all. We have too much current to leave any deposit at all. Ours is all destruction there.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Go ahead, tell us what you wish us to know.

Mr. SIMON. That is about all I know about it, the damage we are having there. If there is nothing done about it, in a couple of years there are 200 farms that will not be any more, they will just be gone.

Senator ELLENDER. Did you plant any wheat this year?

Mr. SIMON. Yes; we harvested our wheat. Mr. Wilke bought that wheat and put it in the elevator.

Senator ELLENDER. It was not quite mature?

Mr. SIMON. It was pretty green, pretty wet.

Senator ELLENDER. Did you get a market price for it?

Mr. SIMON. I do not know what I am going to get.

INCREASED RAINFALL

Senator STENNIS. Do you have more water now than 10 years ago?

Mr. SIMON. We had 9 inches more this time than we ever had had. We have had five floods in the last 9 years.

Senator STENNIS. Why do they come more frequently?

Mr. SIMON. I believe because the dams started on the river have not been completed.

Senator STENNIS. You mean some of the dams that have been built have not helped?

Mr. SIMON. I think that is it. I think at the present time we need a levee to stop it in our particular area.

Senator ECTON. Have you not had more rain in that country in the last 10 years?

Mr. SIMON. We have had a little rain, but I do not know whether it is more.

Senator ECTON. Maybe not in your territory, but it seems to me that this 8-inch rain in 24 hours is a lot of water.

Mr. SIMON. Yes. What causes it I do not know.

Chairman McKellar. If there are no further questions, gentlemen, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Simon.

Mr. Simon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF K. H. HANGER, ST. LOUIS, MO., CHIEF ENGINEER OF THE MISSOURI, KANSAS & TEXAS RAILROAD

LEVEE CONSTRUCTION, ST. CHARLES, MO.

Chairman McKellar. The next witness is Mr. K. H. Hanger.

Mr. Hanger. My name is K. H. Hanger, St. Louis, Mo. I am chief engineer of the Missouri, Kansas, & Texas Railroad.

Chairman McKellar. Have you a prepared statement?

Mr. Hanger. No, Mr. Chairman, I do not have a prepared statement. A good many things that I have listed have been taken care of by these other gentlemen, so I will not reiterate them.

You know where the lands are that will be protected by the levee in this area. The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railroad follows the left bank of the Missouri River northeast from St. Charles for about 5 miles where the river bends abruptly. The railroad continues on to Marchens where it joins the Burlington Line and they both use the same line from that point into St. Louis.

A substantial amount of the agricultural land is subject to overflow between St. Charles and Marchens and is protected during the lesser floods by the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railroad embankment and by private levees. These are not sufficiently high to take care of the more severe floods.

Chairman McKellar. Who built those levees?

Mr. Hagner. The levees that are there were built by levee districts, by farm interests.

The greatest flood of record in that river was in 1944. So far it has not been equaled. The next flood is the one that is just passing.

There was a very severe flood in 1903 and then until 1935 there were no devastating floods in that area. There were some high waters but no devastating floods. There were severe overflows in 1935, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1947, and the one that is now on.

Chairman McKellar. Judging from these pictures, your railroad was put out of commission.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Hanger. We are definitely out of commission and will be for some little time in that bottom area east of St. Charles. We have not been able to evaluate the damage because we have not been able to get into it. It is all covered with water. We have no estimate of what damage has occurred in this last flood. We know that ours is great, and we know that everybody else's in that area is likewise great, farmers and the other railroad, but from 1935 up through 1947, to interests other than the railroad there was $6,195,000 damage from floods. To the two railroads there was $1,540,000 damage, making a total of $7,735,000 that occurred from 1935 through 1947. That means six major floods in 15 years and five bad floods in 9 years. That does not include any losses of business, only the physical damage and cost of detour for us.

That $6,195,000 in agricultural damages we obtained from the United States district engineer at Kansas City. These always occur in the spring and the agricultural effort is largely lost for the year.

These things come with much more frequency than they did previously to 1935. In other words, we went for nearly a third of a century without a bad flood. In the subsequent 15 years from that time there have been six bad ones. There would be reason to believe that there would be a diminution of them in the years to come.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you have any idea what causes them to come more frequently? Is it more rainfall or anything that has been done to the river?

Mr. HANGER. I do not know, sir. Whatever may have been done to the river materially contributes to them. I am in no position to state to what extent the navigation works that were put in the river have conributed to any floods. But apparently the floods do come and the discharge is not as great as it used to be to produce the same gage height of water.

CONSTRUCTION OF LEVEES PART OF PICK-SLOAN PLAN

We think that the construction of the levees now in this area would be a material benefit and levees in that area are a component of the Pick-Sloan plan and have been authorized. I do not know that any appropriation has been made for them, but they have been authorized by some of the acts of Congress a few years ago.

The profile of the design flood on the plan, sketch, or description of the levee section of that act shows higher water than the 1903 flood. I do not know how it would relate to the flood that is just passed, but that being true, levees constructed to accept that height would take care of anything but the very severest floods in that area and assuming that they breech once in a half century it would be better than having six floods in 15 years or five floods in 9.

I am talking about the levees that the engineers have contemplated. I find no fault with the proposals to do the work on the river, any of them, but do earnestly suggest that the planning of these levees be advanced rather than to wait until all the other works further up the river are completed before they are undertaken.

Senator STENNIS. Those are what you call local protection levees?

Mr. HANGER. Yes; from St. Charles down. There may be some hummocks of land down there, but I doubt that you would find any satisfactory heights to tack into, that would take care of other than minor floods. I think you could build parts of it and tie in and consider it if you did not want to do all at one time.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We had a flood in Memphis a short time after I went there as a youngster to practice law. At that time across the river in Arkansas that river was as wide as 40 miles.

Mr. HANGER. I used to go to Forrest City, Senator. I made some levels years ago.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And the city of West Memphis where the river used to be that wide is about second or third in size of the cities of Arkansas.

Mr. HANGER. They have made a remarkable improvement in the conditions there.

Chairman McKellar. It shows what can be done if you plan and carry out the plan.

Mr. Hanger. I do not think you can find any fault with the planning that was done by the engineers.

Chairman McKellar. I see my friend from Mississippi bowing his head. He knows as I do what a wonderful thing this plan has been to that tremendous area south of Memphis that is protected by the levees all the way down to the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Hanger. That is very true. There is no doubt that the coordination of this plan will do the same thing.

Chairman McKellar. I think it ought to be coordinated. I want to suggest to the general that I think it ought to be coordinated and worked out as fast as possible.

Mr. Hanger. But because of the levees that would take care of that being so close to adequate protection for anything in that area, I think it would be entirely safe to reprogram that area in advance of doing all the work up the river.

Chairman McKellar. All right, sir; we are very much obliged to you.

Mr. Hanger. I do want to say one thing about this Grouse Cut. The metering into that by the Geological Survey during this flood indicates it has taken some 65,000 second-feet, which approximates 10 percent of the flow of the river while the peak flow was on, which was a considerable diversion. It would seem to me it would merit right serious consideration to stop it, and quickly.

Chairman McKellar. If there are no further questions, we will call on the next witness.

Mr. Hanger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF LACHLAN MacLEAY, PRESIDENT, MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, ST. LOUIS, MO.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN AND TRIBUTARIES

Mr. MacLeay. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am Lachlan MacLeay, president of the Mississippi Valley Association. My residence is in St. Louis.

Chairman McKellar. What is your business?

Mr. MacLeay. President of the Mississippi Valley Association, that is my busines. It has been my business for the 29 years I have been with that association.

RESTORATIONS REQUESTED

I followed the 1927 flood from the break at New Madrid clear through to Bayou Des Glaises. The Mississippi Valley Association, which is a voluntary, nonprofit association with members in 23 States in the Middle West and the South, hopes that this committee will restore the appropriations recommended by the budget for Gavins Point and Oahe and that it will restore the amounts for Garrison and Fort Randall as recommended by the budget, all of which were deleted by the House.

TUTTLE CREEK PROJECT, KANSAS

We also hope that this committee will recognize Tuttle Creek regardless of the fact that it is a new project and will appropriate not less than $5,000,000 for the Army engineers to start Tuttle Creek right away.

I want to say, gentlemen, that Tuttle Creek could have been built for $50,000,000. It was authorized in 1938, it was incorporated in the Pick-Sloan plan in 1944. It could have been built at that time for about $50,000,000. In 1947 the estimated cost was $56,000,000. It was testified here yesterday that the estimated cost now is $79,132,000. In other words, the price has gone up, and it has not been built.

I want to state without equivocation that it is our belief that had the Tuttle Creek project been completed and been in operation, the flood that just struck in the State of Kansas would not have damaged Manhattan, Topeka, or Lawrence nearly as severely as they were damaged, probably very little, and it would have saved the levees at Kansas City. In other words, for lack of spending a paltry $50,000,000, and we are talking about billions and giving them to foreign countries all the time, we have caused a damage of $1 billion. And we do not know yet what the answer is. That is not even the beginning of it.

Talk about $1 billion lost in this flood. Gentlemen, the value of the topsoil that has gone down the river is two or three times that.

ST. CHARLES PORTAGE DES SIOUX LEVEE, MISSOURI

Here is this project, the St. Charles Portage Des Sioux levee, down at the mouth of the river. There are 90,000 acres in that area. There are two very important railroads there. They have been flooded five times since 1943. All it needs is a small levee to be built around as far as Marchens, which is 12 miles, which will protect a great part of it.

We came here last year, and this committee very generously put in the bill $1,000,000 for the St. Charles Portage Des Sioux. It was lost in the general shuffle after it got down to the House, and the whole thing was reorganized in view of the Korean War which had just come upon us. The project has never been started.

We do not agree in any way with the idea that this project, so necessary to these people in this section and the two great railroads, for a paltry $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 expenditure should wait upon completion of all the reservoirs on the upper part of the Missouri River.

CAPE GIRARDEAU LEVEE, MISSOURI

Yesterday you saw the Chief of Engineers' report to the Secretary of the Army in which there were recommended levees at Wood River; we are for it—at Chester; we are for it—down the river at Perry County; we are for it—at Cape Girardeau; we are for it. If we can build the levees down there without counting on the reservoirs built above, why can we not build this one which is so necessary to the people of this section?

Gentleman, you have no idea of the destruction that has occurred there in the last 10 years. That levee was adopted in 1944, and it

could have been built then. The whole thing was only $8,000,000 to complete it all the way around.

ALTON DAM

Now I want to say, gentlemen, that this Missouri River has cut through here, and I am informed on excellent authority that 65,000 second-feet of water is flowing into the Mississippi here above the Alton Dam.

Here is the Alton Dam [indicating]. This is the project of the upper Mississippi navigation. This water is pouring in here at the rate of 65,000 second-feet, which is a darned big river, gentlemen. That is one-tenth of the entire flow that is coming out here, 600,000 second-feet out here. One-tenth is going across there now, and it is cutting a bigger and bigger channel all the time. There is no reason for that; there is no reason for it at all, and to say that we have to wait for this project to be completed until all the dams on the upper river are completed is silly; it is asinine.

The Mississippi Valley Association has worked for years on these projects. We have worked with this committee. The chairman of this committee has been one of our best friends over the last 36 years. I met the Senator 29 years ago when I came with the Valley Association. I met you, Senator, right after that, in Memphis, and you had just returned from Russia, and you made a very, very fine speech at our meeting.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

We have had these meetings all over the country. We have followed this whole plan, this entire mid continent plan. This map here we got out in 1948. I brought it up to date last night by blacking in this reservoir up here, which is Oahe. Those in black are either completed or under construction. Those in red are the Army engineers' programs. Those in salmon color are the programs of the Bureau of Reclamation. I outlined in blue pencil the Missouri Basin. See what a big part of the entire mid continent area the Missouri River Basin is. You can see what a tremendous part of it it is. Every bit of this water from this tremendous area of 553,000 square miles comes right down on these people on the point. They are entitled to that protection. They are fine citizens; they are fine people. These gentlemen who have testified before you this morning have not told you of the terrific personal losses they have had. They are taking it with their chin up, but those men have lost what many of us would consider fortunes, in this flood, and in previous floods, and hundreds of their neighbors have suffered greatly.

Senator ECTON. Did you appear before the House committee, Mr. MacLeay, this year?

Mr. MACLEAY. No; we were not given an opportunity to appear before the House committee on this project. This project was not up in the House. We worked with the committee, we worked with the members of the committee.

I have not had such an opportunity as has been given to us here today by the chairman and this splendid committee of the Senate.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I think the House committee is composed of highly conscientious members, and they want to do the right thing. It is a question of opinion.

Mr. MacLeay. I do not doubt their sincerity a bit, or their good intentions, but, gentlemen, the land and water is the basis of our prosperity. That is the basis of our civilization. When our land and our water is gone, this country will be gone, too, and our land is rapidly going down to the sea, and we do not want it down there, and they do not want it either. The most important problem today before the American people is the preservation of our land and water and the restoration of our water tables.

LAND LOSSES

Senator Stennis. You can recoup those losses, but you cannot get the land back.

Mr. MacLeay. No; but by proper contouring and terracing, you can build the land back up again in time, but you cannot get back what has gone down there.

I have been told by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture that 735,000,000 tons of our good top soil goes down the Mississippi River every year, and during floodtime enough soil goes down every second to cover a 40-acre farm with 7 inches of soil. I got those figures 2 years ago from the Soil Conservation Service. They can verify them.

Senator Stennis. How much every second?

Mr. MacLeay. Enough to cover a 40-acre farm with 7 inches of topsoil. That is, during a flood. That is what is happening now—that does not happen every day.

Chairman McKellar. If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you.

Mr. MacLeay. Thank you, Senator; we deeply appreciate the opportunity to present our case.

Gavins Point Project, South Dakota

STATEMENT OF C. C. SHELDON, MEMBER OF THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE AND DIRECTOR, CONSUMERS PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT, COLUMBUS, NEBR.

PICK-SLOAN DEVELOPMENT OF MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Chairman McKellar. The next witness is Mr. C. C. Sheldon, Columbus, Nebr.

Mr. Sheldon. I am a member of the Missouri River States Committee, and director of the Consumers Public Power District of Columbus, Nebr.

I have a prepared statement which I would like to have placed in the record.

Chairman McKellar. Would you put the statement in the record, and then you may go ahead and make such comments as you like?

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF C. C. SHELDON, DIRECTOR CONSUMERS PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT, COLUMBUS, NEBR.

Members of Congress have been elected to outline and provide for certain activities of our Government. In that capacity the Pick-Sloan development of the Missouri River Basin has been approved and various agencies authorized and directed to design and construct the project.

Plans have been prepared, schedules of progress established and appropriations for construction requested and granted. The work is well under way and on schedule.

Now there appears a danger that appropriations may be reduced to an extent that will disrupt the schedules. This would cause serious consequences in many areas.

All of our defense agencies are concerned about a possible shortage of power.

Any interruption in the progress of construction of a project, such as the one under consideration, is expensive in many ways. Delays cause waste of material as well as time. The carrying charges and depreciation on partly completed construction add greatly to the ultimate cost.

In making this statement I represent the board of directors of the Consumers Public Power District of Nebraska. Like Members of Congress we are elected, by the people of a subdivision of the State.

We want to cooperate with the Federal Government and the other nine States in the Missouri River Basin by using the amount of power allotted to us from that produced by the Pick-Sloan development. We have all of the transmission and distribution facilities required to do this within the State of Nebraska, but our plans will be of no avail if the construction is delayed until our power supply is exhausted.

The people who elected us look to us to have their power available when they turn the switch.

Do you wonder that we are concerned? Very, very much concerned.

Every other supplier of electric power looking to the same source for his requirements is in the same precarious position.

The sequence is simple. Each purchaser looks to his supplier. We must cooperate or chaos results.

There is another consideration of prime importance and general concern. The conservation of our natural resources.

High among those is our running water. Every drop allowed to reach the sea without rendering its fullest service is a loss that cannot be retrieved. And that is not the whole loss because every kilowatt of power that might have been generated by water, but was not, has consumed the fuel required for its production which might have been saved for other uses.

These considerations have been presented because they are my immediate responsibility but when you add these to the overwhelming need for flood regulation you have a demand that cannot be ignored.

The soundness and magnitude of the Pick-Sloan concept marks a high in engineering and technical skill.

The wisdom and statesmanship expressed in its approval, authorization and continued support mark a corresponding high in a much neglected field of national endeavor.

The action of our Congress and the devotion of our technicians are thoroughly appreciated and we cannot believe that any action at this time will be permitted to destroy this magnificent conception.

Respectfully submitted.

Mr. SHELDON. I do not think it is necessary to take much time to make any additional remarks. I would like to thoroughly endorse the statements made by the Governor of South Dakota, Mr. Anderson, and Governor Peterson of Nebraska when they addressed this committee yesterday. They went all over the ground.

The States in the Missouri Basin are in thorough accord with regard to the Pick-Sloan development.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Those gentlemen made very excellent witnesses, too.

Mr. SHELDON. They always do. They are thorough, they are sound in their conclusions, and their constituents thoroughly appreciate it.

We also appreciate the work of the Army engineers, as I have stated in my statement. We think that that marks a high in engineering and technical development.

We also appreciate the act of Congress in approving and authorizing this project. We think that that marks a high in a much-needed field of legislation. We cannot think that that is going to be destroyed by the failure of an appropriation for work that has been already approved.

The thing that has impressed me here most, gentlemen, in these hearings in the last 2 days is the impossibility of laymen trying to rearrange construction schedules for such a vast undertaking as the Pick-Sloan development. The thing that we can do best is to let the engineers go ahead and make the construction as outlined.

Chairman MCKELLAR. It is the only way that the Congress has to help the situation. We all want to help and work toward the end of accomplishing what is desired.

Mr. SHELDON. That is the way we feel.

UTILIZATION OF POWER FROM PICK-SLOAN DAMS

Now, to illustrate that in another way, I have identified myself as director of the Consumers Public Power District of Nebraska. We want to make use of any power that is allotted to us from this Pick-Sloan development, but we have to have a margin of safety in generating capacity. If we are going to have this power, we will not provide the capacity, of course, because, if we had it, we could not use this power from the Pick-Sloan development. If that schedule is disrupted, we will be without power. Our customers look to us and not to anybody else, to furnish them with that power, so the thing that concerns us is the disruption of these schedules, and we cannot understand how that happened in the House Appropriations, because it was thoroughly presented, and it was a great surprise when it happened.

RESTORATION REQUESTED

The only thing that we are pleading for now is the restoration of the appropriations that will permit the schedules of the Army engineers as they were presented.

Senator ELLENDER. That is, $5,000,000 for Gavins Point?

Mr. SHELDON. Yes. And without that, gentlemen, the Fort Randall project will be only a stream-flow proposition.

Also, if you want to talk of economy and profit, Gavins Point has the greatest potential profit motive of any of the developments on the Missouri River, and I do not know of any greater any place.

Chairman MCKELLAR. If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you. Thank you for coming.

Mr. SHELDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF W. R. COOLEY, SPRINGFIELD, S. DAK., PRESIDENT, SOUTH DAKOTA AND NEBRASKA MISSOURI RIVER VALLEY FARMERS AND RANCHERS ASSOCIATION

GAVINS POINT DAM PROJECT, SOUTH DAKOTA

Chairman McKELLAR. The next witness is Mr. W. R. Cooley.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is W. R. Cooley, of Springfield, S. Dak. I own and operate and live on a cattle ranch which borders the Missouri River. I have lived on this place and operated it for the past 40 years.

I am representing a group of landowners in this valley, which runs up and down the river above the proposed Gavins Point for a distance of 35 to 40 miles.

Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement. I am afraid I will not have time to read all of it.

Chairman McKELLAR. You can place it in the record and give us the high lights of it.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF W. R. COOLEY

The location of the proposed Gavins Point Dam is on the Missouri River in southeastern South Dakota, 4 miles west of Yankton, S. Dak. The reservoir created by this dam would cover the valley land, which averages 2 to 3 miles in width and would extend up the river a distance of approximately 35 miles.

This reservoir would inundate about 50 square miles of valuable farm land and reduce the value of another 50 square miles of land adjacent to said project by about 50 percent. The land in the reservoir area is fertile and has an annual average precipitation of 24 inches and has a value of $50 to $200 per acre. Corn, oats, and alfalfa are the principal crops and it is very well adapted for livestock production, especially cattle. Our association is primarily interested in keeping this land for agricultural use and not having it permanently destroyed by a dam and reservoir.

We are opposed to the proposed Gavins Point Dam project for the following reasons:

1. To date, from all facts and evidence submitted by the proponents of the Gavins Point project, such facts and evidence have not shown the feasibility of this project when determining a "cost to benefit" ratio.

2. That it is necessary to economize in every way possible in order to have funds and critical materials available for purposes of national defense. Our association contends that the Gavins Point project is not necessary nor is it useful in the national defense program.

3. It is our understanding that the legality of the project is based upon its usefulness for flood control, when in fact from all evidences of the materials available from the Corps of Engineers and the proponents of this project the main purposes of the Gavins Point project are reregulation of the uneven surges of water released from Fort Randall Dam 80 miles upstream and for recreational and power purposes.

4. The said dam has little or no value for flood control, as it will hold when filled to capacity less than 1 percent of the total planned storage capacity of the reservoirs in the Missouri River Valley above Gavins Point. It is planned to be used for power production. Since it has only a 45-foot head of water, it will have to be kept practically full at all times for power production, hence it will have practically no value for flood control.

5. The total planned storage capacity of the reservoirs in the upper Missouri River Valley is approximately 75,000,000 acre-feet compared to 540,000 acre-feet for Gavins Point Dam. The planned storage capacity will hold the entire average flow of the Missouri River for 3.8 years, and this is perhaps 10 times as much storage as is needed for flood control. The recent flooding of Kansas City and other places downstream was not caused by excess water from the upper Missouri River, since the Missouri River stages have been below normal in this area all summer.

6. It is claimed that the main purpose of Gavins Point Dam is to reregulate the uneven surges of water coming through the Fort Randall Dam, which is 80 miles upriver. This plan is not practicable or workable, because of the silt carried in this water. According to studies made by the United States Army engineers, the average annual sediment discharge of the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak., for the years 1939 to 1947, inclusive, is sufficient to fill the Gavins Point Reservoir in 10½ years. It will be claimed that most of this silt coming down the river will be held in reservoirs upstream and will not enter the 80-mile section of the river between Gavins Point and the Fort Randall Dam. This may be correct in some respects, but the water will again pick up silt during the 80-mile run between the two dams. The river bed in this area is mostly fine sand and the drop in elevation is 12 inches per mile. This rate of fall and the large volume of water will cause the river to cut out the river bed and erode the banks and carry this silt into the Gavins Point Reservoir. The Niobrara River empties into the Missouri River about 5 miles above Gavins Point Reservoir. This is a fast-running stream and heavily laden with silt. It has been suggested that another dam will have to be constructed in the Niobrara River to prevent the silt from going into the Missouri River in order to extend the useful life of the Gavins Point Reservoir. There are also a large number of small creeks entering the Missouri River in this area; hence it is not practical to have too much of a fluctuation in water discharges through Randall Dam, whether we have or have not the Gavins Point Dam.

7. So far as we know there is no shortage of electric power in the area around Gavins Point. It has been stated and never denied that in the State of Iowa power production has always been 15 percent above peak demands. The Randall Dam alone will produce as much electric power as is now used in South Dakota. The Garrison Dam in North Dakota will probably produce more electric power than is now used in North Dakota. If the Government agencies are not expecting a large power surplus, why are they asking for appropriations to construct transmission lines to carry the excess power into Iowa, Nebraska, and Minnesota? It now appears that certain Government departments are trying to get into production and control of most of the electric energy to be produced in the Missouri River Valley in an effort to drive out the private power companies who have thus far provided for most of the needs of this area.

8. As I have previously stated it is claimed that Gavins Point is necessary to level out the surges of water coming through the Fort Randall Dam, as an aid to navigation. Why should so much money be spent now during the defense emergency to protect navigation on the Missouri River when records show that freight transportation has lost money every year and the volume is too small to be even given serious consideration? Also, records will show that around 75 percent of the income of the farms of the great Northwest is derived from farm animals and their products. River transportation is too slow and in the wrong direction for most of these products.

9. We feel that the rank and file of the people are not as favorable to these projects as the proponents of the projects would have you believe. By checking your own records you will find that the proponents of Gavins Point project besides the Army engineers are usually mayors of some cities near the project or representatives of such cities' chambers of commerce which in itself must indicate to you that their motives are selfish and they are not keeping in mind the over-all benefits derived from a project but only such direct benefit as will flow to them through increased business during the course of construction of said project.

Finally, we urge those agencies of Government and the Congress of the United States, which must pass upon the feasibility of Gavins Point project, to give it their most careful study before appropriating any sums of money for the construction of said project, because:

1. It is of no consequence or benefit in the over-all pattern of the Missouri River Valley development program.

2. Even if navigation were of any importance it would be a barrier to navigation above said dam.

3. It will result in the unnecessary flooding of the most valuable agricultural lands in the valley and will be an unnecessary duplication.

4. It would have very little, if any, flood control value or for irrigation.

5. It will raise havoc with the economy of all the farms and ranches, not only in the reservoir area, but all the upland adjoining farms and ranches which depend upon the bottom lands for their main source of income.

6. The cost of said project, being an unnecessary expenditure can be added to the appropriations for Fort Randall and Garrison, which projects are under construction and therefore, should be completed as early as possible.

7. The cost as estimated is too great compared with the benefits received therefrom and can never be recovered through such benefits.

8. The Gavins Point Dam has no practical value in the local area and no possible value from a national viewpoint.

We respect the attitude of your committee's actions during the past several sessions of Congress in denying any and all funds for construction work for Gavins Point project and we feel assured on past performance that the action taken on this project by your committee this year will be as wise and as fair in its judgment as in the past.

LOCATION OF GAVINS POINT DAM

Senator ELLENDER. Are you in favor of this project or against it?

Mr. COOLEY. I am against the Gavins Point Dam project.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Give us your reasons why you are in opposition to it?

Mr. COOLEY. I will read a few paragraphs of my prepared statement.

The location of the proposed Gavins Point Dam is on the Missouri River in southeastern South Dakota, 4 miles west of Yankton, S. Dak. The reservoir created by this dam would cover the valley land which averages 2 to 3 miles in width and would extend up the river a distance of approximately 35 miles.

RESERVOIR AREA

This reservoir would inundate about 50 square miles of valuable farmland and reduce the value of another 50 square miles of land adjacent to said project by about 50 percent.

The land adjacent to this valley land which will be inundated is mostly grazing land. The hills along each side of the river valley are used mostly for grazing land and most of the ranchers there own grazing land and the river-bottom land. It is necessary to raise feed on the valley land to carry the livestock through the winter months, to make a year-around business.

Senator ECTON. So when you are deprived of the winter feed, then your upland is no good?

Mr. COOLEY. It takes the two to balance out a system, the upland grazing land is not of any value unless we have the feed from the lowland to carry the cattle the year around.

Senator ECTON. Are you located in this area that will be flooded?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. I have lived there for 40 years, right in that area, and own a portion of it. That is the reason why I was chosen as their spokesman.

The land in the reservoir area is fertile and has an annual average precipitation of 24 inches and has a value of $50 to $200 per acre. Corn, oats, and alfalfa are the principal crops, and it is very well adapted for livestock production, especially cattle. Our association is primarily interested in keeping this land for agricultural use and not having it permanently destroyed by a dam and reservoir.

OPPOSITION TO PROJECT

We are opposed to the proposed Gavins Point Dam project for the following reasons:

It is our understanding that the legality of the project is based upon its use for flood control, when, in fact, from all evidences of the material available from the Corps of Engineers, and the proponents of this project the main purposes of the Gavins Point project are reregulation of the uneven surges of water released from Fort Randall Dam, 80 miles upstream, and for recreational and power purposes.

TO BE USED FOR POWER

The said dam has little or no value for flood control, as it will hold, when filled to capacity, less than 1 percent of the total planned storage capacity of the reservoirs in the Missouri River Valley above Gavins Point. It is planned to be used for power production. Since it has only a 45-foot head of water, it will have to be kept practically full at all times for power production. Hence, it will have practically no value for flood control.

STORAGE CAPACITY

The total planned storage capacity of the reservoirs in the upper Missouri River Valley is approximately 75,000,000 acre-feet compared to 540,000 acre-feet for Gavins Point Dam. The planned storage capacity will hold the entire average flow of the Missouri River for $3\frac{8}{10}$ years, and this is perhaps 10 times as much storage as is needed for flood control.

The recent flooding of Kansas City and other places downstream was not caused by excess water from the upper Missouri River, since the Missouri River stages have been below normal in this area all summer.

It is claimed that the main purpose of Gavins Point Dam is to reregulate the uneven surges of water coming through the Fort Randall Dam, which is 80 miles up the river.

Senator ELLENDER. It is a place to pool that water so it will not run down the river too fast; is that correct?

General CHORPENING. That is correct.

SILT CONDITIONS

Mr. COOLEY. This plan is not practicable or workable, because of the silt in this water. According to studies made by the United States Army engineers, the average annual sediment discharge of the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak., for the years 1939 to 1947, inclusive, is sufficient to fill the Gavins Point Reservoir in $10\frac{1}{2}$ years. It will be claimed that most of this silt coming down the river will be held in reservoirs upstream and will not enter the 80-mile section of the river between Gavins Point and the Fort Randall Dam. This may be correct in some respects, but the water will again pick up silt during the 80-mile run between the two dams. The river bed in this area is mostly fine sand. However, we have a fertile soil built on top of the sand, 2 or 3 feet deep, which makes productive land.

Chairman McKellar. What are your principal crops?

Mr. Cooley. The principal crops are corn, oats, alfalfa hay, some wheat and barley.

Chairman McKellar. This is not a wheat area?

Mr. Cooley. We raise some wheat, but wheat is not given much consideration—some, but not a great deal.

The area is mostly fine sand, and the drop in elevation is 12 inches per mile. I might add that this is a very rapid drop in elevation for a river of the size and volume of the Missouri River, and the cutting rate and capacity to carry sediment depends on those two factors, the drop per mile and the volume of water.

EFFECT OF NIOBRARA RIVER ON GAVINS POINT PROJECT

The Niobrara River enters the Missouri about 5 miles above Gavins Point Reservoir. This is a fast-running stream and heavily laden with silt. It is suggested that another dam will have to be constructed in the Niobrara River to prevent the silt from going into the Missouri River in order to extend the useful life of the Gavins Point Reservoir. There are also a large number of small creeks entering the Missouri River in this area, hence it is not practical to have too much of a fluctuation in water discharges through Randall Dam, whether we have or have not the Gavins Dam.

So far as we know, there is no shortage of electric power in the area around Gavins Point. It has been stated—and never denied—that in the State of Iowa power production has always been 15 percent above peak demand. The Randall Dam alone will produce as much electric power as is now used in South Dakota. The Garrison Dam in North Dakota will probably produce more electric power than is now used in North Dakota.

If the Government agencies are not expecting a large power surplus, why are they asking for appropriations to construct transmission lines to carry the excess power into Iowa, Nebraska, and Minnesota?

POWER PRODUCTION

I might add at this time that when this excess power developed by these dams on the main stems of the Missouri is carried in any direction, either west, south, or east, we are getting that power into those areas where they will have cheap fuel and can produce electricity quite cheaply. As we go south into Kansas and into Nebraska, we get near the oil fields, where fuel is cheap. As we go into Iowa, they have coal production about the middle of Iowa, and hence they can produce cheap electricity.

Chairman McKellar. To what extent are the farms in that area electrified?

Mr. Cooley. I think we are around 85 or 90 percent electrified in South Dakota, that is, the farms are.

Chairman McKellar. Has that not been one of the greatest improvements for the farmers? We had nothing like that when I was a boy and living on a farm. When I see the use of electricity on the farm now it just makes my heart glad that the farmers have it. It is wonderful thing for our country, do you not think so?

Mr. COOLEY. It is a wonderful thing, but here is the situation: The farms will practically all be electrified throughout Nebraska, South Dakota, and perhaps North Dakota, before any power is available from the Missouri River Dams. When this power comes in, it will be practically all excess power above the requirements because Iowa is not an industrial area, generally speaking. There is considerable industry in eastern Nebraska.

PRESENT POWER SOURCES

Senator ELLENDER. Where do you get your power now?

Mr. COOLEY. I understand they are getting a little power from Fort Peck into western South Dakota and probably western North Dakota, but practically all the power in our area is coming from the private public-service corporations. They are furnishing power to the REA lines. So far as I know, every REA line has had ample power, as soon as they have asked for it.

Chairman MCKELLAR. At what price? For what price do the farmers get this electricity? Do you have any figures on that?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the bill for the average farm for power purposes would run $8 to $10 per month, and they are using considerable power for pumping water and for their milking machines. I think that would be approximately correct for, say, 200, 300, or 400 kilowatt-hours per month. Some of them are using 500 or 600. Of course, that would cost more.

There is one point, in running over my statement I do not seem to find right now, but it has been brought out very well by Senator Kerr here, that in all this Pick-Sloan plan we are really missing the fundamental problem in that great northwest country.

EROSION CONTROL

Our biggest and greatest problem is saving our topsoil. To save the topsoil, we must keep most of the water where it falls. Now the practices and methods and tillage operations are being developed very rapidly. It is claimed now that there are probably 150,000 farm and ranch dams in the area in South Dakota, running up the Missouri Basin, and into Montana, and we are fairly certain that the amount of water from the Missouri River is decreasing year by year. We are not getting the floods that we had 20, 30, or 40 years ago.

Chairman MCKELLAR. That is not the evidence of recent events out there. They seem to have more.

Mr. COOLEY. In our area—we are 300 or 400 miles from the area where they have had this great trouble.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are you in a different watershed?

Mr. COOLEY. You might call it in the Missouri River Valley watershed, but we are above that area of heavy rainfall. The Missouri River in our area has been below normal in river stages this summer. It has never been bank-full. That trouble in Kansas City and below has all been from the water in that area and not water coming down from Montana and the two Dakotas.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The evidence here was that the floods on the Kaw River or Kansas River caused most of the trouble at Kansas City. Is that correct?

CONSTRUCTION OF DETENTION DAMS BY FARMERS

Mr. COOLEY. That is absolutely correct. It is a local condition in that particular area.

Senator ECTON. When did the farmers in South Dakota commence building these smaller dams you mentioned—these dams to hold back the cloudbursts and the extra precipitation that you mentioned? How long have you had those?

Mr. COOLEY. I think that that started about 10 years ago. It is being developed very rapidly—building these small dams on the farms. They are constructed by the farmers and ranchers, with a little help from the Soil Conservation.

Senator ECTON. That is within the Soil Conservation Division. Is that not this soil conservation that Senator Kerr was talking about this morning? That is under a different item. That is under "Soil-conservation districts," as I understand, where all you farmers go in and form your own district and the Government gives you engineering advice and helps on part of the cost?

Mr. COOLEY. That does not cover the whole situation. There are many of these dams that were put in entirely independent of the Soil Conservation. There are a good many dams put in by the farmers and ranchers, entirely at their own expense and under their own supervision, but, in addition to that, a great many of them are put in—I suppose half or more, maybe three-fourths—under the supervision of the Soil Conservation people and in soil-conservation districts. That is developing very rapidly and also contour farming and different tillage methods.

I cannot help but believe that much of the floodwater will be stopped, and will not go into the Missouri River at all.

SIZE OF BIG DAMS CONSIDERED UNNECESSARY

I cannot help but believe that the big dams on the main stem of the Missouri River—I would hardly say are unnecessary, but they are much larger and bigger than is necessary for flood control. I am really afraid of them. They are all dirt dams. If the water goes over the top of one of them, they would wash out.

Senator ECTON. There would be a flood then.

Mr. COOLEY. You would have the worst flood in the history of this country if one of those dams would be washed out or blown out. If you released the water from one of them, it would take all the rest of them out.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Where would the water go?

Mr. COOLEY. It would go right down the Missouri and the Mississippi. The dams will hold, as they have proposed and planned, enough water to cover the State of South Dakota approximately 12 inches deep. That would be enough to flood every city and take out every bridge between our country and New Orleans. It is a dangerous situation.

Senator ECTON. I think we should state here, Mr. Chairman, that we have a lot of confidence in our Army engineers, and in looking over some of the largest earthen dams in the world that they have built, which have been subjected to tremendous pressure and sudden increases in flood conditions, they have shown evidence that they are pretty stable.

Mr. COOLEY. I have faith, and want to commend the Army engineers for their good work. I believe in flood control, but, along with that I would like to make the suggestion that that amount of water in storage is probably dangerous.

Now, I might refer to the Bonneville Dam and the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River. I was told with respect to a flood that they had there, when a number of lives were lost, in a little town along the Columbia River below the two dams a few years ago, that the water went over the tops of both these dams. Of course, they were constructed either by the Army engineers or the Reclamation Service.

FLOOD CONTROL DAMS QUESTIONED AS TO MULTIPLE PURPOSES

Senator ECTON. I think you hit the nail on the head a while ago when you said dams constructed primarily for flood control to take care of sudden precipitation, sudden thaws and cloudbursts and sudden increases of water, cannot be used to their full capacity for power generation.

Mr. COOLEY. The two do not go together, in other words.

Senator ECTON. If you are going to have full capacity of power developed, you have to have a full dam, and if you have a full dam and full reservoir, you just do not have the capacity to take care of your flooding conditions, such as we encountered in Kansas and Oklahoma and Missouri last week. It cannot be done.

Mr. COOLEY. I tried to bring out that point in reference to the Gavins Point Dam. It is just a small dam, of course, but it will not work out as a storage dam for flood control, and a hydroelectric dam at the same time. They have to sacrifice one or the other.

Senator ECTON. I believe that in the dams that the Army engineers have built they have allowed for certain extra capacity to take care of these flood conditions. I presume that in the over-all plan, if all the dams were built, why they would be able through these series of dams to take care of possible flood conditions, such as prevailed last week.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I will agree with you, Senator, but with a dam with a head of only 540 feet, such as the Gavins Point Dam, if you let the water drop down a little for reserve flood control, your head of water is too low for power. In a large dam, it would work out—you drop your head of water and have reserve capacity for floods at the same time, but you cannot in a small dam like we have proposed at Gavins Point.

Senator ECTON. What has your association done so far in opposition to the building of this Gavins Point Dam? Have you appeared before committees previously, down here?

Mr. COOLEY. I have not, but a man with me, an attorney, Mr. Engle, whom we have employed, has appeared here twice, I believe, in the past 2 or 3 years and filed a statement in opposition. This is my first trip to Washington for this purpose.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is there anything further you wish to say? If not, we thank you very much for coming here.

Mr. COOLEY. Thank you for this opportunity of appearing here, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The committee will stand in recess until 2:30 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

GAVINS POINT DAM PROJECT, SOUTH DAKOTA

Chairman McKellar. The committee will come to order.

Senator Ellender. In connection with the testimony on Gavins Point project, I was handed a statement prepared by James R. Smith, manager, Chamber of Commerce of Yankton, S. Dak.

I wish to ask that it be put into the record.

Chairman McKellar. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

REVIEW OF URGENT REASONS FOR APPROVAL OF BUDGET BUREAU RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MISSOURI RIVER PROJECTS IN FISCAL 1952

FLOOD CONTROL

Disastrous floods with damages nearing a billion dollars and 33 lives have proved again the urgency of completing the planned flood-control program in the Missouri River Basin. Had Gavins Point, Oahe, and the other up-river dams been in operation this month, the Missouri River could have been held at a very low stage above the mouth of the Kansas River. Thus the roaring floodwaters would have entered a low-level river bed instead of a full one. When the river can be turned off like a faucet, flood crests can be cut several feet with the concurrent elimination of millions of dollars in damages.

In the past decade expensive floods have occurred in other reaches of the Missouri and its tributaries. The 1943, 1944, and 1947 floods struck upstream cities and farms as seriously as the current flood has affected downstream areas. In those years the presence of the Oahe Dam just above Pierre would have protected that city from serious damages, and the presence of the Fort Randall and Gavins Point Dams would have saved several million dollars damages further downstream.

The projects authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944 will protect the entire valley, comprising one-sixth of the land area of the United States.

Gavins Point Dam will drain the Niobrara River Valley and 16,000 square miles of drainage area below the Fort Randall Reservoir. It will protect the area from its site to Sioux City, Iowa, and will increase the protection provided by authorized levee projects extending downstream from Sioux City.

The Oahe Dam, which will impound 21,800,000 acre-feet, Fort Randall, which will impound 6,200,000 acre-feet, and Gavins Point Dam, which will impound over a half-million acre-feet plus reregulating the entire flow of the river through the area protected by levees from Sioux City to the mouth, will provide a completely integrated system of flood protection throughout the entire length of the Missouri River.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE GAVINS POINT DAM TO THE FORT RANDALL DAM AND RESERVOIR

Gavins Point Dam and Reservoir is an integral part of Fort Randall which is 40 percent completed. Without Gavins Point, Fort Randall if operated at its design capacity will send surges of water downstream which will create havoc to farm lands, eroding and destroying acre upon acre of fertile bottom land, precluding navigation on the lower river and causing serious danger each winter from ice jams. Without Gavins Point to reregulate the stream flow below Fort Randall, the river below Sioux City will revert to its wild untamed state.

POWER

The power function of Gavins Point is to generate 100,000 kilowatts of badly needed electricity plus the added function of firming up about 200,000 kilowatts of Fort Randall power. As a benefit secondary to the integrated flood protection, a total of 320,000 kilowatts of added power will be provided by the construction of the smallest dam on the Missouri River.

This is the cheapest electricity to be generated in the entire Missouri system.

Gavins Point Dam will effectively extend the market area for river power an additional hundred miles to the south and east into areas in Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota of greater population density.

TIME ELEMENT AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Bureau of the Budget approved $5,000,000 for the 1952 fiscal year, stating that this year is the last opportunity to start construction in time to complete Gavins Point simultaneously with Fort Randall. If this is done both dams will begin their integrated function in 1954 or 1955. If Gavins Point is not started now, Fort Randall cannot function properly and $4,800,000 per year will be lost from the sale of power alone in addition to the absence of flood control and other benefits. Gavins Point Dam will pay for itself in 10 years.

The 1954–55 proposed completion date is soon enough to make Gavins Point important to the national defense even on a short-term basis.

The Budget Bureau and the Corps of Engineers have justified Gavins Point in relation to the national defense stating that the whole Missouri River system will not operate effectively without it, that essential river navigation will be halted without it and that the electric power it will so cheaply provide is badly needed in the area.

CONCLUSIONS

To protect money already invested in other parts of the integrated program.

To make full use of the Fort Randall Dam, of which Gavins Point is a relatively small but an essential and integral part.

To provide an integrated flood-control program to supersede the wasteful and uneconomic random projects which inadequate funds have necessitated.

To prevent ever-recurring floods throughout the valley.

To create another 320,000 kilowatts of electricity—the cheapest on the entire Missouri River system and to add the 400,000 kilowatts available from Oahe to the defense needs of the country.

To prevent the loss of millions of acres of fertile farm lands through uncontrolled erosion.

To provide proper stream flow to make possible continued navigation on the Missouri River.

To expedite the national defense by saving farms and industries from floods, by expanding the power generation facilities and by stabilizing the economies of nine States in the valley.

And to keep faith with the citizens of the Missouri River Valley who are relying on Congress to complete the flood-control program as authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The $5 million recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for Gavins Point and the $3,770,000 recommended for Oahe should be approved by Congress in order to complete the integrated Missouri River flood-control program as soon as possible.

Chairman McKellar. Suppose we proceed with the hearing, and when Mr. Dexter comes in, we may have to stop temporarily. But we will go ahead with the other witnesses.

STATEMENT OF HON. SID SIMPSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION, BEARDSTOWN, ILL.

Chairman McKellar. Congressman Simpson, is this the same project that Senator Dirksen is interested in, or not?

Representative Simpson. I think so, Senator.

Chairman McKellar. When he arrives, we will have him present his statement.

Representative Simpson. I represent the Twentieth Illinois District. I want to thank the committee for giving us the time to present this information to you.

Chairman McKellar. Now, let us see. Is that the map of the upper Mississippi?

Senator Ellender. That is the upper Mississippi, from Cairo to the North.

Representative SIMPSON. Your committee very kindly offered us 20 to 30 minutes for two witnesses, including the mayor and myself.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Yes, sir. We will be glad to hear from you. I am trying to see on the map the proposal that you are interested in.

Representative SIMPSON. Beardstown, Ill. It is in Cass County, Ill., and the county where Senator Lucas was born, and it was from the same county that Senator Dieterich was from when he was in this body.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I know both of them very well. They were both good friends of mine; and, Lucas, I sat next to him for a long time.

Representative SIMPSON. Without being presumptious, I asked him to come to you gentlemen about this project.

Chairman MCKELLAR. He has already talked to me about it.

Representative SIMPSON. He authorized it in the Senate, and I worked on it in the House last year. We asked Senators Douglas and Dirksen both to help us. I have about a 3-minute statement.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I believe both of them have spoken to me about it.

All right, sir. Go ahead.

Representative SIMPSON. After I finish my statement, Mayor Ring would like to say something.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST

We are asking for an appropriation for flood-control protection at Beardstown, Ill., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, House Document No. 332, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,976,000.

Because of the limitation of the time allotted, only two of us will testify. Other than myself, there will be Mayor George Ring, of Beardstown, Ill.

I think the committee has had a few letters from citizens of Beardstown, relative to this request.

Chairman MCKELLAR. That is true.

Representative SIMPSON. I hope you have had one from both Senators Douglas and Dirksen.

I hope you have not been too bothered with them, and I want to say that you can hold me responsible for that, because I have been interested in getting the project considered.

YEARLY FLOOD DANGER

Beardstown is a city of some 6,500 people. We get floods practically every year. The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad's division point and shops are located in Beardstown.

We have a defense plant. One of the largest flour mills is located in Beardstown. They are in danger now. They are in danger every year.

This year, the Mississippi River has been at the highest point it has been in 100 years, and this was before the Kansas City flood.

The flood has affected them at the present time on the Illinois River. They are in trouble practically every spring and summer, due to floods.

In 1928, the State of Illinois and the city of Beardstown built a sea wall about 28 feet high. Here is a picture of it.

(The photograph referred to has been made a part of the committee files.)

This is a picture showing where it collapsed. That was built by local and State interests, not the United States Army engineers.

FLOOD-WALL PROJECT

During the flood of 1943, troops came to Beardstown at the request of my office. President Roosevelt sent them in. Local people sandbagged the sea wall to about 34 feet. It was not the fault of the engineers that they built it only 28 feet high. They were told, at the time of the construction of this wall, by the engineers, that 28 feet would protect them forever from water.

During the 1943 flood, 4,000 people were evacuated from the city. In 1949, a 100-foot section of the sea wall caved in while the river stage was normal. That is the picture that I showed you.

Albert Engel, who at that time was chairman of the House Subcommittee on Civil Functions, helped me, and, in 2 days' time, the United States engineers were on the job and repaired it.

This is on the left bank of the river, on the east side.

Chairman McKellar. How far is that from Chicago?

Representative Simpson. It is about 200 miles, about 240 miles.

Chairman McKellar. And almost north, is it?

Representative Simpson. It is southwest of Chicago and north of St. Louis.

Chairman McKellar. That is right.

Representative Simpson. Here is what happened: When that sea wall was built, and built 28 feet high, and then the engineers constructed the navigation dams on the Mississippi, starting at Alton, these big barge lines, much bigger than they used to be and the Diesel engines, when those Diesel barges go through the bridge, which is an old wagon bridge, then their stern is turned against the sea wall, and the big backwash from those barges is cutting from underneath that wall, until it resulted in what you see in the picture.

They did not build the sea wall with the intention of that kind of backwash against it constantly. This work was started, and the whole thing is ready to collapse if they do not get enough money to repair it and strengthen it.

The Illinois River has a fall of only 28 feet in 162 miles, from Peoria to the mouth, which is not very much; in fact, a half inch to the mile.

The United States engineers estimate that under normal conditions, based on 1948 prices, a flood similar to 1943 would cause damages of $5,500,000.

I would like to quote the language from paragraph 6 of the letter to the Secretary of the Army from R. C. Crawford, major general, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, relative to this whole project:

> The District Engineer finds that a serious and imperative flood problem exists at Beardstown. The concrete floodwall can no longer be depended upon for adequate protection, and the adjacent levees are of insufficient grade and section.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that Beardstown, from the flood control standpoint, has more flood problems than any other section of Illinois, unless it would be down near Cairo. I think this plan was taken care of.

We have asked Senator Dirksen and Senator Douglas to appear in behalf of this appropriation. We have also asked former Senator Lucas to do likewise.

This location of the sea wall is in the county where former Senator Lucas was born, and also the home of former Senator Dieterich.

May I add that our experience has been that, when a flood comes, it does not pay any attention as to whether or not people are Republicans or Democrats, whether or not they are Protestants or Catholics, whether or not they are Jew or Gentile, or whether or not they are black or white. It comes just the same.

This is a nonpartisan issue, as for as we are concerned. I know the problem we are facing, and I would not be here asking for a dollar if I did not think this was needed.

PROPOSAL FOR COMMITTEE INSPECTION

I will make this statement: If, before you write up this bill, your committee will go out and visit this flood wall, if you do not agree that this is needed, I will pay the expenses from Washington there and back, personally.

I hope the committee will be able to provide the funds needed. Remember, gentlemen, there is involved here more than protection for business houses. Homes where people live and churches where people worship, homes and worship for over 6,000 souls, are involved. They should be saved, and only this committee can save them.

Beardstown has a problem worse than Kansas City had, because it is absolutely built on a flat piece of ground. It was built there by the early settlers when they came up the river in canoes and rafts, when they had no other transportation. They have to go 4 miles before they can get to any elevation higher than this table, for their protection. There is not enough boats and skiffs in that area to evacuate that town if you get a flood, and that wall can collapse either in high water or low water, at any time.

Chairman McKellar. How large a place is Beardstown?

Representative Simpson. Over 6,000 people.

As far as I am concerned, gentlemen, I would rather see a little money go to people in the United States, and protect them, at least part of it, than to see it all go to Europe, Asia, and Africa.

I hope you can grant the request.

Senator Ellender. Did you appear before the House committee?

Representative Simpson. Yes, I did.

Senator Ellender. With what results?

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET ACTION

Representative Simpson. The result was nothing; nobody else got any, because of the Presidential directive of last summer, stopping all so-called new projects.

I do not consider this a new project, myself. But they stopped all of them by that directive. The civil functions subcommittee in the

House refused any project—even Congressman Spence, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and we offered the amendments on the House floor when it was before it. The only amendment they took when it was on the floor was to change the name of a dam from Bull Dam down there to Judge Kerr. That is the only amendment.

Chairman McKellar. That is the Buggs Island Dam.

Representative Simpson. That is the only amendment that the House accepted on the civil functions bill, to change the name of that dam.

Senator Ellender. I suppose that is because it did not cost any money to do so.

Representative Simpson. We need this, and we need it badly.

Senator Ellender. Is there a budget estimate on it?

Representative Simpson. $2,936,000.

Senator Ellender. Is that the budget estimate?

Representative Simpson. That is the engineers' estimate. The budget did not submit it.

EMERGENCY FUNDS APPROPRIATED BY CONGRESS

That was due, Senator Ellender, to that directive of the President. Now, regardless of the directive, Kansas City happened, and the House and the Senate authorized $15,000,000 and an amendment on the House floor by John McCormack, an amendment by him, they raised it to $25,000,000, without a budget estimate. The budget did not know they were going to have a flood in Kansas City.

Thank you very much.

Chairman McKellar. Thank you.

May I ask the Corps of Engineers a question for a minute.

First, however, I would like to ask you one question, Congressman.

This photograph does not present the situation as it is now, does it?

Representative Simpson. It is just exactly that way. The only difference is that the engineers went in and repaired that.

NAVIGATION PROBLEM

Here is what you have to remember, Senator. Since the heavy Diesel barges come up through that bridge, and then their stern is turned against that sea wall, every barge that comes through there with the backwash from the boat is undermining the back of that wall.

Senator Ellender. Could you not put some piling in there?

Representative Simpson. They do not know how much damage there is.

Senator Ellender. I know, but I mean, out in the stream, to prevent the barges from coming too close.

Representative Simpson. I do not think there is enough room. The whole gap comes through an 1,100-foot section, from one levee, from the east side of the river, to the other. They do not know how much damage is done to that wall, due to the backwash. They know it is inadequate. Since they built it in 1938, they had to sandbag it in 1943, and then they barely saved the town.

The town is composed of 6,000 people in an area just as flat as this table. They are absolutely in a worse position than Kansas City was before they had their flood. There is no place for them to go.

Chairman McKellar. General, I would like to hear from you about this. Has it been brought to your attention before?

General Chorpening. Yes, sir, and, as has been stated, it is an authorized project, authorized last year. It was not included in the budget because of the established criteria.

Chairman McKellar. It would have been included, but for that order?

General Chorpening. Yes, sir. It has every reason to be included. It is a worthy project.

Chairman McKellar. Would is cost $2,976,000?

General Chorpening. It would cost more than that now, sir, because that is an estimate made a few years ago. Construction prices have gone up, so it would cost something more than that.

Chairman McKellar. Do you have any idea about how much it would cost?

General Chorpening. About $3,200,000.

Chairman McKellar. At the present prices?

General Chorpening. Yes, sir.

Chairman McKellar. All right, sir. Senator, we would be very glad to hear from you, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, A SENATOR IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION, BEARDSTOWN, ILL.

Senator Dirksen. I wanted to say a word about this Beardstown matter, because I have been familiar with it for years.

I say with some modesty that once upon a time I was a drainage contractor for a number of years, and I topped out the levee that is just below Beardstown, South Beardstown levee and drainage district.

You will remember, Senator Ellender, when we were talking about theories. Well, right below South Beardstown, they have leveed that area of the lowlands, on both sides. I guess it goes down 16 miles, and then Coal Creek and Crane Creek and the adjoining levees, and that must go down there 20 miles, or thereabouts.

The mistake, and I say it with all deference to the Army engineers, is that they permitted those levees to be built too close to the river, too close to it.

That water comes coursing down from the northern end and, of course, there is no place for it to go except up; and so it backs up there at the curve. I have seen the time at Beardstown when you had a 50-foot circle in the middle of town which was the only dry area in the town.

Mayor, am I right on that, or not?

Mayor Ring. Yes, sir.

Senator Ellender. Did the Army engineers design that?

Senator Dirksen. No; these are private levees. But I have always contended that those levees were permitted to be set too close to the river.

Senator Ellender. Well, the Army engineers did not do that, did they?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I think they have authority to indicate, do they not, General, how close up to the shore those levees should come, before they are approved?

General CHORPENING. As I recall it, there were levees there originally, these levees were built before the Federal Government adopted the national policy on flood control.

Chairman MCKELLAR. There is another question that I want to ask you.

BARGE TRAFFIC

Looking at this picture, it loks like it would be very difficult for a barge to come through there. Do you have a use for barges?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes. There is barge traffic up and down the river, and products are increasing in tonnage and volume.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Yes; the oil and steel?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, oil and steel—coal particularly.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I do not see how they could come under the bridge.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, they swing or lift, either one. You then have no difficulty passing under it.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I will take it all back.

Senator DIRKSEN. So that is the picture that you have today. You have to back up there, and the backwash, as Congressman Simpson pointed out—and, frankly, of all the towns that you could name in Illinois, with the exception of Cairo, which is always threatened with 20 feet of water when it comes up high, this is one of the most difficult problems out there.

Of all the towns that are deserving of consideration, Beardstown is certainly one of them.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Could I ask the general another question right there?

Is that bridge in use now, after all of this water around it that you see in this picture?

General CHORPENING. I have not seen the bridge. I saw the picture, and I believe that I am correct that they are planning to build a new bridge there.

Representative SIMPSON. Would you let me answer, if I may?

Chairman MCKELLAR. You may proceed.

Representative SIMPSON. About 2 years ago, in fact, there was something interesting about that bridge.

That bridge was built in 1896, and it is a wagon bridge. It is just barely above the bed of the river. When the river is at flood stage, in fact, it has been a foot over.

The State of Illinois and the Governor, and the director of public works and buildings, have publicly stated that the first bridge to be built with the increase in gas funds in Illinois is to be that bridge, to replace that one. That is a tie-in with this program of the Federal Government.

Illinois just increased their gasoline-tax money and the first bridge to be built in Illinois, by the promise of the Governor publicly, is the bridge to replace that one.

That bridge cost $26,000 in 1896, and an LST boat hit it in 1943 and the damage was $65,000, paid for by this Congress.

You cannot hardly pass on it and it cost $26,000, the whole bridge.

Senator DIRKSEN. You see, Senator, as money becomes available, all of those old bridges are being replaced over the Illinois River. Over the years, a number of new ones have been built.

FLOOD DANGER

But the problem here for Beardstown is the flood problem at the moment. It could be inundated at any time. You never know, circumstances being what they are, and the water being bottlenecked there, with no place to go except up, until it knocks off the crown of the levee and goes over.

Senator ELLENDER. How often is that city visited by a flood?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, it is threatened constantly, I think, by nearly every high water that I know of.

The flood that I was referring to was the one that came in 1922, when you had a circle of 50 feet in the city square, which was the only dry area in the whole town.

In addition to Beardstown, I wanted to say a word about a project that is in difficulty as a result of the present Mississippi flood. It is known as Prairie du Rocher and Modoc drainage and levee district. It is down at the lower end of the river.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is that on the Illinois River?

Senator DIRKSEN. No; this is on the Mississippi River. That was the only unleveed area between East St. Louis and Cairo. It contains 16,000 acres.

In 1945 the landowners organized. General, I suppose this is on the map, is it not?

General CHORPENING. That is right. It is right here on the map.

CONSTRUCTION OF LEVEE

Senator DIRKSEN. There was a very big hole there, 16,000 acres. They went in and organized to improve it. They spread the assessments, and had them confirmed in the county court.

With Federal aid they proceeded to start building the levee. That is the astonishing thing—they did not finish it. I do not know what happened to the contractor.

Normally, when you build a levee you start from high ground, and you go down all the way to the end, and then you repeat the operation, because the earth settles. You put more on, and more, with a dredge or whatever you have.

Only part of this levee was built. I do not think there was even a sweetpotato raised in there. So what you have today is this kind of a situation: With Prairie du Rocher district, population of 650, $2,200,000 Federal funds already spent, or will be spent, by the end of this year; you have a gap in that levee, both at the south end and at the north end. It is not going to be any more effective, in that way, in keeping water out of there, than that picture on the wall. Either your levee is completed or it is no good.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST, EXPENDITURES, AND BUDGET REQUEST

Chairman McKellar. It seems that the total estimated cost, as of July 1951, of Prairie du Rocher, was $3,807,000, and the allotment to date on that project is $2,200,000. The budget has added $900,000 to it. How does that suit you?

Senator Dirksen. Well, no, Senator. If my figures are correct, the total estimated cost, at the time that the estimate was made, was $3,250,000, and $2,200,000 would have been spent by this summer.

Senator Ellender. $2,870,000?

Senator Dirksen. Yes, sir. These are revised figures.

Chairman McKellar. Yes; but I imagine that the practical part that you are interested in is the addition of $900,000 by budget action.

Senator Dirksen. I did not see this revised budget estimate. That, to me, is interesting because on three or four occasions I have talked to my good friend in the Budget Bureau, and I talked with him no later than this morning.

Chairman McKellar. General, that is correct, is it not?

General Chorpening. That is correct. We have presented that estimate to the Bureau of the Budget only this morning, sir, from the Secretary of the Army to the Bureau of the Budget.

Senator Dirksen. Well, I should fill in, for purposes of the record, that I talked to Mr. Lawton, of the Bureau of the Budget. They sent a special investigator out. He got the district engineer in St. Louis, and they took a good look at all of this within the last week or 10 days.

Then they came back and made a report. He said to me, "Well, this is top priority, even though the President may have in mind setting up a little pool of other areas where they need some attention."

I did not see this revised estimate. I think the customary restraint on the part of the Budget Bureau was in evidence, and I say that with all kindliness, because Mr. Lawton is a very fine, esteemed gentleman. Perhaps he wanted that information to be here first.

Chairman McKellar. What is the other budget?

Senator Dirksen. Then you have Prairie du Rocher, which is presently pending before this committee.

I can only say, in view of the fact that there is water over that land at the present time, and it involves two railroad properties—the Missouri Pacific, which used to run a train every 20 minutes, hauling troops and coal and everything else, in the First World War; they are under water at the present time; and the Missouri Illinois, which runs from the Lead Belt in Missouri to the coal miles in Illinois. Those are the defense aspects of this thing that I think are vitally important.

I am delighted that that estimate is before you; and, while the economy stream in me moves very, very deeply, I recognize a disaster when I see it, and have been familiar with it over a period of time.

I trust it will commend itself to the good graces of the committee.

In addition, I want to reaffirm my interest in the city of Beardstown, because of the fact that it is a good-sized city and the people are absolutely at the mercy of the water, and that has been a menace so long that something is going to have to be done or you are going to get a damage picture that will probably show the engulfment in dimensions which will be beyond anything that you have had before.

Chairman McKellar. Thank you very much. Are there any other witnesses?

Senator Dirksen. I think Congressman Bishop would like to say a word.

STATEMENT OF HON. C. W. BISHOP, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

LEVEE CONSTRUCTION, CAIRO TO PRAIRIE DU ROCHER, MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Representative Bishop. Going right on down the river, Congressman and Senators, from Cairo to Prairie du Rocher, there are levees in some places, but the seepage is causing the floods, and the ground is under water at the present time.

They are asking for help or pumps, to pump out this seepage. I think the engineers have put in two or three, but a greater number are needed.

This also is going to call for expenditures later on to make these levees stronger.

There is no chance of the water going over the levee, but it is going through—there is seepage.

Chairman McKellar. That is at Cairo?

Representative Bishop. Yes, sir.

Chairman McKellar. North of Cairo?

Representative Bishop. Yes, sir.

Chairman McKellar. How far north of Cairo?

Representative Bishop. It is all the way down to the farm lands—I would say, to Chester. That is just below Prairie du Rocher.

As the Senator told you, referring to this land that is flooded, there are 14,000 acres in one spot now under water because this levee was not completed. The floodwaters have now spread all the way down to Cairo.

I have pictures here, for evidence, which show how it is at the present time.

Senator Ellender. Is that caused by the seepage?

LEVEE SEEPAGE

Representative Bishop. That is right. It is not in Prairie du Rocher, but down below, where the seepage is. You know what I am talking about—you have spent millions of dollars there for levees, but the seepage is coming in at the present time to flood those alfalfa fields, and farm lands which extend all the way through the bottoms.

Senator Ellender. Is that seepage of recent origin?

Representative Bishop. No; it goes on all the time.

Senator Ellender. Is that because of faulty construction of the levee?

Representative Bishop. Well, it is going to have to be reinforced, sure.

Then, I would like to present the fact that you have given us, of course, new information on the budget, just now. The flood condition down there exists from year to year with the Mississippi. You know that as well as I do.

Senator Ellender. Do I know about it? Yes; I certainly do.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Representative BISHOP. Industrial areas are being flooded as well as agricultural areas, and the damage, of course, runs into millions and millions of dollars.

We are here today to just give you the actual conditions. May I say, when you see headlines like this, they are placing the blame for disastrous floods on the Congressmen. I, of course, represent the Cairo district.

Senator ELLENDER. You are the one blamed?

Representative BISHOP. That is right. I am the one that is blamed.

So, I hope that you men will give these applications careful consideration. I am sure that the engineers are not recommending something that should not be done. They have been very fine to cooperate with us and with the people as a whole. There is a lot of work to be done. I have 125 miles of that Mississippi shore line, the entire length of which is flooded, either by the water going in where the levees should be or else by seepage.

Thank you, gentlemen, for giving me this opportunity of testifying to this condition.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I know of a big dam that is about three-fifths completed, on the Cumberland River, and they just cannot understand why I cannot have that work continued. They have put in for it.

My folks down there just cannot understand why I cannot raise a hand and get it done.

Representative BISHOP. I believe that you are on the spot more than I am.

We have a dam on a lake in my home town, a flood-control project, which is just one-third completed.

Well, thank you, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Yes, sir; we are glad to have had you.

Representative SIMPSON. With the indulgence of the committee, could I have one more minute, and then Mayor Ring has a short statement.

Here is what I wanted to call your attention to, that I did not mention a few moments ago.

In Illinois, you have what they call Lake Springfield, the water supply for the State capital, Lake Decatur, water supply for the city of Decatur.

There is no legislation that I know of, either State or national, to take care of impounded water. The shore line of one of those lakes is 25 miles.

When they get their lake full at floodtime, they open the gates, and the water comes right down the river and empties into the Illinois, just at the front door of Beardstown.

Remember, there is no legislation of any kind that I know of to take care of impounded waters, either national or State, and they can dump all the water they want from Lake Decatur or Lake Springfield, and it empties right at Beardstown, and they do do it.

Another thing: If this committee will grant the request as to this appropriation, if, in the wisdom of the Bureau of the Budget and the President, they say it should not be done now, they can impound

the funds, and the city would not complain. We know it should be done, but the funds will then be available when they take the impounding off.

I now present to you Mayor Ring of Beardstown. He has a short statement to make.

Chairman McKellar. We have a vote, and we will have to go in about a half a minute.

We will have to go and vote now, and we will have to ask you to suspend for a few moments, until we come back.

(Brief recess.)

Chairman McKellar. The statement of Mayor Ring of Beardstown,, Ill., will be placed in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

To the Chairman and Members of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee:

We need $3,000,000 now because—

1. In June of 1948 a 100-foot portion of the concrete sea wall at Beardstown, Cass County, Ill., slid forward and overturned. Emergency repairs were made immediately by the Federal Government; however, upon a thorough investigation by the United States Corps of Engineers of the remaining portion of the 3,200 feet of sea wall, the district engineer found approximately 2,000 feet, or two-thirds of the wall, was in danger of being undermined. Also the survey showed that the same foundation was used as was previously used where troublesome sand boils had been a source of trouble during the flood of May 1943. Also the survey showed that most of the flashboard supports which were built and used to withstand 2 feet of additional water were now no longer serviceable.

2. During the period of 1940 to 1950 the population of the United States increased about 13 percent while for the same period Beardstown's population decreased 10 percent. Because of inadequate flood protection, new industries and also existing industries have failed to build or expand here, therefore offering less employment and causing returning GI's and graduating high-school students to look elsewhere for employment.

3. The watershed of the Illinois River above Beardstown drains an area of 23,400 square miles. (One thousand square miles lie in Wisconsin and 3,200 square miles in Indiana.) Since the founding of Beardstown 122 years ago, naturally much advancement in civilization has taken place. Many drainage and levee districts have been organized in the above-mentioned area, thereby draining large tracts of land that were previously sloughs or lands which acted as reserve reservoirs, while levee districts almost follow the river channel on both sides continuously, therefore limiting the width of the river during flood stages. In addition, with the straightening of the Sangamon River in 1949 by the Federal Government, water now reaches Beardstown from Springfield, Ill., approximately 36 hours sooner than previously. These three factors, accompanied by heavy rains or early spring thaws, cause additional flood hazards to Beardstown through no fault of its own.

4. It is generally believed that the city of Beardstown was saved from flooding in 1943 only by the strenuous efforts of military and civilian personnel. Approximately 1,000 troops were dispatched from nearby Camp Ellis, Ill., who were assisted by local citizens, including high-school boys and girls who filled and carried sandbags. Camp Ellis is now inactivated, since we are not now officially at war, thereby making local available personnel inadequate for the protection of Beardstown.

5. During the record-breaking flood stage of May 1943, 14 levee and drainage districts along the main stem of the Illinois River did not hold and were flooded. Since that time several of these district levees have been raised and strengthened. Directly across from Beardstown, on the western banks of the Illinois River, the Coal Creek levee has been rebuilt and raised at Federal expense to withstand a river stage of 454.4 feet. Since our existing sea wall will furnish protection only to water level of 447.9, it is reasonable to expect that our community would be flooded before temporary relief from nearby broken levees could be obtained.

6. At the record-breaking flood stage of 1943, Beardstown would have been covered with an average depth of 7 feet of water. Based on 1948 estimates, the damage to Beardstown alone would have been in excess of $4,500,000 (15,000 acres) in excess of $1,000,000 making a total estimated direct loss of upward of $5,500,000, while we are requesting slightly over 50 percent of possible direct damages of one flood (using 1948 valuations) for our protection. Since the year 1844, Beardstown has been severaly damaged by floodwaters on nine occasions.

7. The city of Beardstown is located on the Gulf Waterway (Chicago to New Orleans). In establishing this Gulf Waterway, the Federal Government saw fit to install a series of locks and dams to maintain a minimum 9-foot channel. One of these dams is located at New La Grange, which is 9 miles below Beardstown. Being so near to these locks and dams, Beardstown is in a position to feel the effect of silt accumulation which tends to raise the river channel, thereby making further flood protection necessary, as over a period of years further silting will tend to raise the river level at Beardstown with no increase in cubic feet of water per second passing our city.

8. It is our understanding that House bill No. 2827 has successfully passed both Houses of Congress. Briefly here this afternoon we have attempted to present our reasons why immediate action is necessary to protect our citizens and their property. The citizens of Beardstown sincerely appreciate the time given and interest shown by you gentlemen. We are all aware that only in America could a small project such as ours be accorded the same attention as a larger one by a congressional committee.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE E. RING,
Mayor, City of Beardstown, Ill.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, Congressman.

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF HON. WALT HORAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

PLANNING AND SURVEY FUNDS

Representative HORAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am here in behalf of the study and survey moneys that the Bureau of the Budget O. K.'d for the Army engineers and civil functions. They were denied by the House.

I understand that their reason for denying them, as they stated it to me, was that there had already been appropriated and allocated a considerable backlog of study moneys and survey moneys that had not been expended.

However, the use of these study moneys is the very foundation of not only the work of Army engineers in those projects which are authorized by the Congress, but they are also contributory to the work of the Weather Bureau, the Geological Survey, and the International Joint Commission, between ourselves and Canada, and I understand between ourselves and other adjoining nations. So I would ask that this committee follow the advice of General Pick. I understand when he appeared before you he made a strong plea for the restoration of these study moneys.

1952 BUDGET ESTIMATES

I understand the budget allowed $2 million for flood control and $1 million for rivers and harbors on study moneys and some $7 million-plus for surveys.

HOUSE ACTION

When this matter was on the floor over in the House, quite a number of my colleagues and I discussed the possibility of trying to submit an amendment to restore those funds up to the budget allowance. However, since it was a unanimous report on the part of the House Subcommittee on Civil Functions, and they were vigorously repelling any amendments, we decided not to offer such an amendment in the House. This action, in the House on this matter did occur, of course, before the Kansas floods. I think that the Kansas floods, had that tragedy occurred before the bill was on the floor, would probably have made it possible to restore those study-money funds and survey funds on the floor of the House.

Senator ELLENDER. Did the House vote at all on this issue?

Representative HORAN. No, we did not offer an amendment, because we felt we had a good case in appealing to you for those study-money funds. We were sure, having been assured by the Army engineers that they did need these funds, that they were following the curtailment directive of the President last year and were only asking for lesser amounts this year than they had in the past, and so we decided to come over here and appeal to you.

I understand that at least my colleague from Arkansas, Mr. Norrell, has been over here, and Mr. Paul Brown, of Georgia, was very anxious to have a portion of these funds restored, and Mr. Angell, of Oregon, and Mr. Hedrick, of West Virginia. I presume there are others.

Now, if I may, to show you why these are important, I would like to state one specific instance of why this study work is the very foundation of other work of the Government.

There are about 12 international rivers in the Columbia River drainage system. Quite a number of those are in my district, because I have about 250 miles of the Canadian border in my district. Most of those rivers originate in Canada and flow our way. When it seems important for us to have the International Joint Commission work on the problem of settling the difficulties on one of these international rivers so that we can proceed with betterments, since they originate in Canada, naturally if we want it done we have to initiate the work.

CANADIAN WATER TREATY

Now, to settle these things with Canada, in 1909, you will recall, we entered into a treaty with Canada, and that treaty empowered the State Deparment of our country and I believe the Foreign Office of Canada to negotiate on problems arising on international streams and other boundary problems between ourselves and Canada.

Pursuant to that treaty, we set up what is known as the International Joint Commission. It is a joint commission. We have three members, and they have three members.

This Commission was authorized to use existing agencies in order to perform its work. And, of course, that is where the study-money funds of the Army engineers come into focus in this picture. Because the International Joint Commission can do nothing without empowering some existing agency to make studies and see what the problem is.

1948 FLOOD

The major Columbia River flood of 1948 proved to us that one of the greatest dangers on the Columbia River was what is known as the Okanogan highlands. Believe it or not it is 2,500 feet above sea level. But the nature of the terrain there and the tremendous area drained by the Okanogan and the Similkameen River in lower British Columbia does, when you have a tremendous runoff, give you a flood condition in that highland. And we did have it. When this runoff is compressed into a short period, we have a tremendous flow. In fact, the Similkameen itself can have 27,000 cubic feet of water per second during one of those flood periods, and in low water it can get down as low as 120 cubic feet per second.

PROPOSED DAM ON SIMILKAMEEN RIVER, WASH.

That brings up one interesting question, and it is one reason why we would like to have study moneys to make progress on our work with Canada, to see what can be done about the Similkameen River. We would like to build a dam. That is what is known as Shanker's Bend. That is 100 miles or so north and slightly west of the Chief Joseph Dam, which is under construction and has money in this bill.

Chairman McKellar. Is the proposed dam construction in your State?

Representative Horan. Yes. The problem there, however, is that if you build a dam on the Similkameen at Shankers Bend, the kind of a dam the Army engineers have developed, you will backwater about 30 miles into Canada, and, of course, that brings up the problem we have to settle.

However, this river is so low after the floodwaters have receded that we are convinced that if we could have a study made of the riparian rights that affect this river, there is more in the way of water rights given, up to now, than is in the river at low-water time; and that will affect the irrigation problems in the United States and also in Canada.

Now, the denial of these funds is greatly holding up the agreements that we would like to enter into with Canada. Canada naturally shows no interest to act ahead of ourselves in this, because the waters affected originate within her boundaries.

And the International Joint Commission is very anxious to proceed with work on this river after they have completed their negotiations, now nearing completion, on the Kootenai River, where, as you know, we are considering the building of a big dam near Libby, Mont.

Senator Ellender. Has that been started?

Representative Horan. Not the construction of the dam itself. But the negotiations, I understand, are nearing completion. General Chorpening, the conclusions are well along, are they not?

General Chorpening. That is correct. They are well along.

Senator Ellender. Along that line, Congressman, are there any dams built or in contemplation concerning which agreements have been reached between us and Canada, in the event the water backs up into Canada?

Representative Horan. Ross Dam, which is not an Army engineers' but a municipal dam, and one other, I think.

Senator ELLENDER. The question I wanted to ask was: Does Canada require anything? What is the compensation?

Representative HORAN. There have to be agreements. They have to arrive at agreements on the division of benefits and that sort of thing.

Senator ELLENDER. Although we do all the work?

Representative HORAN. No, no. In the case of Shanker's Bend, of course, if we flood their land, as I understand it, we would have to pay them damages.

DIVISION OF BENEFITS ON PROPOSED PROJECT

Senator ELLENDER. But other than that, as far as division of the power is concerned, if it were to be a multiple-purpose dam would they expect a division of electricity?

Representative HORAN. I think they do.

General CHORPENING. That is set up by the International Joint Commission, by treaty. And then working together, set up between our engineers and the Canadian engineers, an agreement is reached taking into full account what Canada loses and what we lose in land, and then the benefits to come. It is recommended then by this International Commission.

Senator ELLENDER. Are the costs of the project shared in proportion to the benefits received by each country?

General CHORPENING. Essentially so; yes, sir.

Representative HORAN. That is a question that has not been fully answered yet.

I believe in the case of the Ross Dam, which serves the City Light of Seattle, all that Seattle pays is flood damages, and the city of Seattle gets all the benefits from that dam, which was the first one to back water into Canada. The agreement is reaching conclusions, as I stated, on the Kootenai River, which will flood quite a way into Canada.

In another case hearings were held a few weeks ago in Waneta, British Columbia, and again at Grand Coulee, by the International Joint Commission, granting the Trail Smelter the right to dam the Pend Orielle River, I believe it is, just north of the border.

And the reason the International Joint Commission had to sit on it—I think it flooded 3 acres in the northern part of my district. But it did cross the boundary, so they had to hold the hearings. But there were no objection and it would not affect the full development of the Columbia River.

But I did want to impress upon you gentlemen the fact that these study-money funds ought to be granted to the extent that the budget allowed them, which is a good deal less than we have had in previous years at different times.

Senator ELLENDER. Have you made a canvass of the House to determine whether or not the House would vote favorably in the event the Senate should abide by your suggestions?

Representative HORAN. I feel certain that the House at this time would.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is this the same dam that you say floods a little way into Canada?

PROPOSED DAM TO BACK WATER INTO CANADA

Representative HORAN. The one we want the study money on to prepare the way for making it an active project is on the Similkameen, and it would back water about 30 miles into Canada.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I believe the agreement was to ask for about 5 years, was it not?

General CHORPENING. I believe that is a treaty between Canada and us which sets up that Commission, Senator.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I am mistaken about that. That was brought up in the State Department subcommittee. I think that agreement ends in about 2 years.

Now, suppose your dam runs a short way into Canada. I would not want to divide that equally or anything like it. Canada ought to take her proportionate part, and I would not be willing to take it up until we found out what was going to be done.

Representative HORAN. Of course, the river is there and we have empowered the International Joint Commission to settle the problems which arise.

Chairman MCKELLAR. That does not mean that we should give our power away to Canada. As far as I am concerned, I would fight it.

Representative HORAN. We have to settle the problems on the river in order to solve our flood problems there.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We do not have to do it with our hands tied.

Representaitve HORAN. I certainly would not want to do that.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And judging from the agreement we now have on another matter, I think it is very unwise for us to take any steps in this matter until we know what that Commission is going to do about it.

I do not know whether my suggestions are worth anything or not, but I suggest that you had better see what is going to be the disposition of that.

Senator ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the Commission cannot act until you make this study?

Representative HORAN. The Commission cannot act until we make the study.

Senator ELLENDER. Is that a joint study?

Representaitve HORAN. Oh, yes.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, it is initiated by us, and I assume that Canada contributes its proportionate share of the cost of the studies.

Representative HORAN. They pay for their part of the studies. That is right. And after we have made the studies and turned those findings over to the International Joint Commission they will go in the area and hold hearings and everybody who has an interest in it has his voice in the matter and may express himself.

Senator ELLENDER. But after that study is made and after the international agreement is entered into it is then brought back to Congress?

Representative HORAN. Yes; it would have to be.

Senator ELLENDER. So that the Senate and the House would then have the opportunity of determining whether or not they would agree to authorize the project. Is that true?

Representative HORAN. I believe that the Senate would act. Is that not right?

General CHORPENING. Yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. But the State Department, I think, would have to act on it first.

General CHORPENING. The State Department would finally act on the findings of the International Joint Commission.

Representative HORAN. I have a prepared statement I would like to insert in the record.

Chairman MCKELLAR. It will be placed in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

RESTORATION OF FUNDS FOR CORPS OF ENGINEERS STUDY PROGRAM

The Corps of Engineers' study program of preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies for flood-control and water-use projects; and of examinations and surveys for rivers and harbors stems from the large number of studies authorized by various flood-control acts, rivers and harbors acts, and resolutions of the congressional Committees on Public Works. The proposed study program for fiscal year 1952 is the result of a drastic curtailment of their normal program to conform with the President's directive for deferral, postponement, or slowing down of all civil-works activities which do not directly affect the defense effort or the civilian activities relating to defense. Only those studies which satisfy the criteria of the President's directive were pursued in fiscal year 1951 and are recommended for initiation, continuance, or completion in fiscal year 1952.

The investigations remaining in the curtailed study program proposed for fiscal year 1952 include studies for providing flood protection of defense industries, railroads, highways, workers' homes, agricultural and food-producing areas; for providing hydroelectric power development for the needs of defense industries; for providing water supplies for industrial, domestic, and agricultural uses; for providing water storage for stream-flow regulation to aid navigation and firm up hydroelectric power production; and for providing water of improved quality for these several uses.

The proposed fiscal year 1952 program of the Corps of Engineers for examinations and surveys, of rivers and harbors is formulated to insure utilization of the navigable waters of the United States to the best interests of the Nation in the present defense effort. This program is geared to meet the changing needs of water-borne commerce to insure that deep-draft oil tankers, ore carriers of advanced design, and other cargo vessels widely used in carrying essential materials to and from defense industries, will all be provided with adequate deep-draft coastal and Great Lakes river and harbor facilities. In addition the program provides for continuing studies for improvement of inland waterways that are utilized in relieving and augmenting other congested transportation facilities that are so necessary for the movement of essential defense materials and commodities. Studies of small craft channel and harbor facilities affecting national defense installations and the production of sea food are also included as an essential part of the river and harbor study program.

Unless funds for prosecuting these studies are restored to the approved budget for fiscal year 1952 it will mean that the detailed studies of complex nature that are now being worked on, some of which are nearly completed, will have to be dropped. No new studies, no matter how essential they may be to the national economy, can be initiated without these funds. In addition, studies currently being conducted by the Corps of Engineers in cooperation with other Federal agencies; such as the studies in the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins, in the New England area, in the Columbia River Basin, and elsewhere in continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, will be seriously hampered without the participation of the Corps of Engineers which these funds permit. If these studies must be suddenly stopped for lack of funds a material increase in the ultimate cost of the report will result when resumed at some subsequent time.

In addition to the performing studies for preparation of reports required by the Congress, these funds are used to carry on a continuing program of collecting factual scientific data for use in making the detailed studies required for the presently authorized and future reports. This program is carried on from year to year in cooperation with other Federal agencies including the Weather Bureau, Geological Survey, Fish and Wildlife Service, and others. Activities of this data collection program include storm studies, general hydrologic investi-

gations, general flood investigations, hydrometerological studies, operation of a hydroclimatic network of precipitation stations, stream gaging, fish and wildlife studies, special investigations requested by Members of Congress which are not covered by usual authorizations, preparation of flood operations regulations for reservoirs, and other studies not specifically covered by usual authorizations.

The results of stopping these continuing programs of collecting data would be far reaching. The continuous record of stream flow, precipitation, hydrologic, and meteorologic data would be broken, opportunity to record data will be forever lost for the time the program is stopped, trained personnel will be laid off or put in other jobs, nonsalvageable equipment will be lost for lack of maintenance, and the program will suffer far more than can be measured in monetary terms.

It is with these foregoing thoughts in mind that I appear here today to strongly recommend that the funds requested for flood control and river and harbor studies in the approved fiscal year 1952 budget be restored in order that this essential work may proceed on the proposed curtailed program approved by the Bureau of the Budget as being in conformity with the President's program.

Chairman McKellar. We will recess until 10:30 a. m., tomorrow.

(Whereupon, at 4:15 p. m., Friday, July 27, 1951, the hearing was recessed until Saturday, July 28, 1951, at 10:30 a. m.)

85787—51—83